

THE LIBERATOR.

VOL. VI.

OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD--OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND.

NO. 9.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.]

[SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1836.]

THE LIBERATOR

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT
NO. 46, WASHINGTON STREET, BY
ISAAC KNAPP.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

TERMS.

TWO DOLLARS per annum, always payable in advance.
All letters and communications must be post paid. The rule is imperative, in order to shield us from the frequent imposition of our enemies.—Those, therefore, who wish their letters to be taken from the Post Office by us, will be careful to pay their postage.
An advertisement making one square, or a space of equal length and breadth, will be inserted three times for one dollar.

REFUGE OF OPPRESSION.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

The following Report and Resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Legislature:

REPORT

Of the Joint Committee of Federal Relations on the Governor's Message as relates to the Institution of Domestic Slavery, and the Incendiary proceedings of the Abolitionists in the Non-Slaveholding States.

Mr. Hamilton of the Senate, from the Committee of Federal Relations, submitted the following Report:

The Joint Committee of Federal Relations, to whom was referred so much of His Excellency, the Governor's Message, as relates to the Institution of Domestic Slavery, and the Incendiary proceedings of the Abolitionists in the Non-Slaveholding States, beg leave to Report:

That they have given to this subject the deep and anxious consideration which both from its intrinsic importance, and from the profound and patriotic reflections of the Executive, it so obviously demands.

They desire to respond in terms of the most emphatic concurrence and approbation to the view, which His Excellency is pleased to present of the mild and patriarchal character of the Institution of Domestic Slavery in the Southern States, its influence on national character and civil liberty, and the nature of those obligations, resulting from our constitutional compact, and the principles of inter-national law, upon which its tenure to this species of property so inviolably rests.

The present condition of the slave question in the States of this confederacy, presents one of the most extraordinary spectacles which, your committee will venture to assert, has ever challenged the notice of the civilized world. We see sovereign States, united by a common league, in about one half of which States, the institution of Slavery not only exists, but its legal existence is solemnly recognized and guaranteed by their compact of union. Yet in the face of this compact, and the clear and distinct admission, that the non-slaveholding States have not the slightest right, either constitutionally or otherwise, to interfere with this institution, the most incendiary associations are tolerated or permitted to exist within their limits, the objects and ends of which not only strike at the prosperity and happiness of eleven States in the confederacy, but at their very social existence.

Painful as it may be, it is impossible to disguise the fact, that this is a condition of things which cannot, in the long run, be permitted to exist. Every wise instinct of self-preservation forbids it. Let it be admitted, that the three millions of free white inhabitants in the slaveholding States are amply competent to hold in secure and pacific subjection the two millions of slaves, which, by the inscrutable dispensations of Providence, have been placed under our dominion. Let it be admitted, that, by reason of an efficient police and judicious internal legislation, we may render abortive the designs of the fanatic and incendiary within our own limits, and that the torrent of pamphlets and tracts which the Abolition presses of the North are pouring forth upon an inexhaustible copiousness, is arrested the moment it reaches our frontier. Are we to wait until our enemies have built up, by the grossest misrepresentations and falsehoods, a body of public opinion against us, which it would be almost impossible to resist, without separating ourselves from the social system of the rest of the civilized world? Or are we to sit down content, because from our own vigilance and courage the torch of the incendiary and the dagger of the midnight assassin may never be applied? This is impossible. No people can live in a state of perpetual contentment and apprehension, although real danger may be long deferred. Such a condition of the public mind is destructive of all social happiness, and consequently must prove essentially injurious to the prosperity of a community that has the weakness to suffer under a perpetual panic.

This would be true, if the causes of this excitement proceeded from the external hostility of a foreign nation. But how infinitely interesting and momentous the consideration becomes, when the flow from the acts and doings of citizens of States, with whom we are not only in unity, but to whom we are bound by the strongest bonds of a common union, which was framed to promote the happiness, peace, security and protection of all.

We have, therefore, a claim on the governments of the non-slaveholding States, not only moral and social, but of indispensable constitutional obligation, that THIS VIOLATION SHALL BE ABATED. They not only owe it to us, but they owe it to themselves, to that Union, at whose shrine they have so often offered up the highest pledges, by which man can plight his temporal faith.

Your Committee would be inclined to recommend to this Legislature to make an explicit demand on the non-slaveholding States, for the passage of penal laws by their legislatures, providing for the punishment of the incendiaries within their limits, who are engaged in an atrocious conspiracy against our right of property and life. But a cordial confidence, a fraternal feeling, and the comity which belongs to our social and political relations, forbid us for one moment to doubt, that every effort will be made by the States to

whom this appeal is referable, to meet not only our just expectations on this subject, but every emergency which belongs to this crisis of public peril. Indeed when we remember the strong demonstrations of public opinion, which were presented at various gratifying public meetings, which were held during the last summer throughout the non-slaveholding States, denouncing as anti-social and unconstitutional the proceedings of the fanatics and incendiaries; when we remember, too, the avowal, universally made, by the public press in those States, that a vast and overwhelming majority of their people viewed such proceedings with horror and detestation, we cannot but believe that every rational expectation, which the slaveholding States can cherish on this vital question, will be cheerfully met and responded to by those on whom we have such inviolable claims.

We concur entirely in the view which our own Executive takes of the grounds, on which our right to demand the enactment of such conservative legislation rests.

Apart from all those obligations, resulting from the constitutional compact, which unites these States, and which make it the imperative duty of one member of this confederacy not to allow its citizens to plot against the peace, property and happiness of another member, there is no principle of international law better established, than that even among foreign nations, such atrocious abuses are not to be tolerated, except at the peril of that high and ultimate penalty, by which a brave and free people vindicate their rights.

Your committee are aware, that it has been said that no legislation can be adapted to arrest the proceedings of the Abolitionists by the non-slaveholding States, without violating the great principle of the liberty of the press. We consider that this objection rests on no just foundation. There is certainly some difference between the freedom of discussion, and the liberty to deluge a friendly and coterritorial state with seditious and incendiary Tracts, Pamphlets and Pictorial representations, calculated to excite a portion of its population to revolt, rapine and bloodshed. We would fain believe, that the Northern liberty of the Press, would never be construed into a liberty, to lay the south in ashes. Under a law honestly passed to meet this crime against society, and treason against the Union, the whole circumstances of the case, and the *quo animo* of the offender might be left to a jury to determine like any other criminal issue, and if we are to believe in the condition of public opinion, as recently exhibited in most of the non-slaveholding States, we are far from thinking that such legislation would be a mere dead letter.

South Carolina will not anticipate the crisis, which must be presented by a refusal on the part of the non-slaveholding States, to accord to us the protection of such legislation, or such other means, as they may select for the suppression of the evils of which we complain, for she will not doubt the good faith and amity of her sister States. She desires to live in peace and harmony in this Union. In the assertion of her rights and in preferring the claims to be secure in the enjoyment of her property, under the compact, she desires to act in entire concert with her States, whose interests are identical with her own. She is, however, prepared to do her duty to herself and posterity, under all and every possible conjuncture of circumstances.

In conclusion your committee, desirous of making a matter of record, both of our rights, and the assertion of the just expectation that they will be respected by those who are united with us in the bonds of a common union, beg leave to offer the following Resolutions, for the adoption of both branches of the Legislature.

1. Resolved, That the formation of the Abolition Societies, and the acts and doings of certain Fanatics, calling themselves Abolitionists, in the non-slaveholding States of this confederacy, are in direct violation of the obligations of the compact of union, disocial, and incendiary in the extreme.

2. Resolved, That no State having a just regard for her own peace and security, can acquiesce in a state of things by which such conspiracies are engendered within the limits of a friendly State, united to her by the bonds of a common league of political Association, without either surrendering or compromising her most essential rights.

3. Resolved, That the Legislature of South Carolina, having every confidence in the justice and friendship of the non-slaveholding States, announces to her co-states her confident expectation, and she earnestly requests that the governments of these States will promptly and effectually suppress all those associations within their respective limits, purporting to be Abolition Societies, and that they will make it highly penal to print, publish and distribute newspapers, pamphlets, tracts, and pictorial representations, calculated and having an obvious tendency to excite the slaves of the Southern States to insurrection and revolt.

4. Resolved, That regarding the Domestic Slavery of the Southern States as a subject exclusively within the control of each of the said States, we shall consider every interference, by any other State or the General Government, as a direct and unlawful interference, to be resisted at once, and under every possible circumstance.

5. Resolved, In order that a salutary negative may be put on the mischievous and unfounded assumption of some of the Abolitionists—the non-slaveholding States are requested to disclaim by legislative declaration, all right, either on the part of themselves or the government of the United States, to interfere in any manner with domestic slavery, either in the States, or in the territories where it exists.

6. Resolved, That we should consider the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, as a violation of the rights of the citizens of that District, derived from the implied conditions on which that Territory was ceded to the General Government, and as an usurpation to be at once resisted as nothing more than the commencement of a scheme of much more extensive and flagrant injustice.

7. Resolved, That the Legislature of South Carolina, regarding with decided approbation, the measures of security adopted by the Post Office Department of the United States in relation to the transmission of incendiary tracts. But if this highly essential and protective policy, be counteracted by Congress, and the United States Mail becomes a vehicle for the transmission of the mischievous documents, with which it was recently freighted, we, in this confederacy, expect that the Chief Magistrate of our State, will forthwith call the Legislature together, that timely measures may be taken to prevent its traversing our Territory.

8. Resolved, That the Governor be requested to transmit a copy of this Report and Resolutions to the

Executive of the several States, that they may be laid before their respective Legislatures.

COMMUNICATIONS.

REPORT

Of the Prudential Committee of the Amesbury and Salisbury Anti-Slavery Society.

Your Committee in presenting to you this Report, for your consideration and adoption, must be excused if they step aside from the common form of a report, and present to your minds the exciting subject of slavery more under the appearance of an Address. They would, rather, place before your eyes, what there is to do, than what you have done; rather than you should stop to rejoice over the cheering prospect of the seed that has been sown, they would urge you forward to scatter and disseminate the seeds of truth and justice to wherever an inch of soil shall be found prepared to receive its glorious burden.

In this day of excitement and interest, your Committee think it to be of the highest importance that every person who professes to be a friend and advocate of the rights of man, should always be ready to give an answer for the hope that is within him. That he should know what is the foundation upon which he is building his hopes of success in this noble and philanthropic cause. That he should know and fully understand the nature of those principles by which he professes to be governed, when he stands up to plead the cause of the oppressed; and also that he should so clearly understand the claims of the gospel, as regards the abolition of slavery, and the claims of the rights of man, that he may be prepared to meet at all times those ten thousand objections against his principles, which come upon him from every quarter, and sometimes clothed in a garb of seeming plausibility.

Your Committee think, also, that there is a fatal mistake abroad in our land, and that too, among many good and conscientious men, relative to the setting free the oppressed; and that this mistake arises from an ignorance of the claims of the God of Heaven upon this subject—yet, if not from ignorance, it is from an unwillingness to obey the requirements of this claim. We sincerely believe if those who hold the slaves in bondage, would proclaim liberty to their oppressed, and thus obey the commands of Jehovah, who says, 'Break every yoke and let the oppressed go free,' all those frightful evils and horrid consequences, which they picture to their minds would be the case arising from immediate emancipation, would be found to be no more than the shadow of a monster, which in their hours of blindness and stupidity, has settled upon their disordered brains. This terrible prediction of consequences arising from immediate emancipation, we think shows plainly a want of confidence in the character of God as a sovereign. Men argue as though they were unwilling to trust the consequences of this, obeying his commands, to his Almighty power and foresight. Who that contemplates God in this character, can for a moment doubt but that he will fulfil his word, when he says, 'I will direct thy steps.' Let men but obey his injunctions relative to the liberation of the slaves, and we believe God in this great question, will step in and accomplish all things for the good of those who put their trust in Him. Your Committee think it becomes them in the presentation of this Report for your adoption, to notice some of the leading objections which are out against us, who are only endeavoring that that glorious privilege which is contained in the sentiment of the Declaration of Independence, shall be possessed and enjoyed by all. If it be true that 'all men are created free and equal, and endowed by God with certain unalienable rights, among which are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,' then we say that equality, and all those glorious privileges and comforts arising from liberty and the pursuit of happiness, are the slave's; unless it can be proved that he is not a man, a task which we will give our opposers their life-time to prove. If the negro is not a man, God's word is not true—if he is a man, the spirit of the preamble of the Constitution of our free republic is basely and wickedly perverted, and the glorious truth stamped upon its broad sheet despised and neglected, so long as a man in our land is denied those privileges there set down, unless he has forfeited them by the transgression of the laws of his Commonwealth. If, again, 'all men are created free and equal,' equality is man's right, and the consequence arising from the surrendering of that right, is a matter of after consideration, and has no bearing upon the question of his liberation, and is no allowance of privilege in keeping him in bondage. We are aware that this is the sentiment which stamps upon the abolitionist the character of a fanatic, and an accessory to murder and rapine. Yet a sentiment in accordance with the word of God, and as clear to our view as the sun in the heavens; and this we will endeavor to prove, after stating one objection to the system of immediate emancipation. It is said that it cannot be right or humane to give the slave his liberty now, because the consequences arising from that liberation would be awful, tremendous to the community at large. That there is a color of plausibility in this method of reasoning, we admit—but yet the foundation of its premises, in our opinion, is false, for if liberty is the right of the slave before he is enslaved, we cannot imagine how the supposed consequences arising from that liberation, can alter the definition of the term. That the justice or injustice of an action is often determined by the consequences resulting from that action, no one can deny; but yet, that in many cases the justice of an act is independent of its consequences, must be admitted to be equally plain. For instance, it was the part of justice and equity for Pharaoh to let the Israelites go forth, even if it had been to the destruction of his whole household, for the reason, that it was the express

command of God. Pharaoh might with a great degree of plausibility, have pleaded as an excuse for keeping the children of Israel in bondage, the consequences resulting from their going out; he might have said to Moses, 'You know not what you require of me! If the Israelites go forth, do you not perceive I am stripped at once of all means of the manufacturing of an article essential to the growth of my kingdom? Yet does any one suppose that God would have countenanced Moses, had he heeded to this objection of Pharaoh? Abraham also was commanded to slay his only son; but had he no more faith in the promises of his God than some Christians in this day, he might have neglected the commands of Jehovah, offering for his negligence, such considerations as the following.—My Father! truly you have required of me a grievous task. Do you consider the consequences arising from this act? Do you consider that Sarah will be deprived of her only son, and that her heart will be torn with anguish on account of this bereavement, and that I also shall go down to the grave in sorrow and affliction?

Paul, also, had he been governed by the doctrine of expediency, as many are at the present day, might have heeded the pitiable lamentations of the Ephesian craftsmen, when they attributed to the spreading of principles which he taught, the destruction of their craft, and in thus giving heed to these considerations, he might have neglected the injunctions of his Master, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel,' &c. Paul was aware that the doctrine which he was commanded to preach, was for the destruction of image worship, and had all the Ephesians been ruined from the forsaking of the worship at the Temple of the goddess Diana, he could not have considered this of importance enough to deter him from obeying the Divine command; he knew that consequences had nothing to do with his duty in this instance, those he felt willing to leave to the charge of Him, who had commissioned him to bear testimony against unrighteousness. Thus did Abraham consider his duty, and thus should Pharaoh consider, and thus must our southern friends consider the subject of slavery, before they can expect the approbation of God. We think the command to Abraham to offer up his son, was no more binding upon him, than the command to let the oppressed go free, is binding upon slaveholders; and if Paul felt himself justified in bearing his testimony against the forbidden sin of worshipping idols, notwithstanding the uproar of the Ephesian craftsmen, so also do we feel justified in bearing witness against the abominable and cursed sin of slavery, notwithstanding the cry and uproar of enraged and furious mobs, and the everlasting harping of consequences.—For where a command of God presents itself, that command must be obeyed, how direful soever the consequence may look to us.

There is one accusation against the friends of immediate emancipation, which your Committee cannot pass by unnoticed. It is an accusation, which, if true, must sooner or later be a cause of sorrow and regret to them, and make themselves not only despicable in the estimation of their fellow-men, but also of themselves. The accusation is this:—that abolitionists, without a candid consideration of the subject of slavery in all its bearings, without any regard for the happiness and prosperity of our country, and the property and lives of our southern brethren, are pursuing a course which is the cause of those terrible manifestations of the displeasure and madness of the slaves against their masters—which is the cause of those scenes of bloodshed which have taken place, and which it is feared will take place again. It is a charge which has gone up to the God of Heaven, and recorded in the book of final reckoning, either to our condemnation, or the condemnation of our accusers. But, why, we solemnly ask, are we the cause of this state of feeling? It is said because we have disseminated our principles in the form of pamphlets and papers through the south, and the slave, from the distribution of these works, has had his eyes opened to see his case, to understand his situation, to know that he is robbed of the glorious bequest of his God, and knowing this, in his hours of madness and desperation, has sought the life of his master. Now to this ungenerous and cruel charge we plead not guilty, from many considerations which we shall attempt to show. There is a difference between a cause and an occasion. That we are the cause of this threatening state of things, we deny; that we may be the remote occasion of this, we will not deny; but how are we the occasion? We answer—in the same manner that the missionaries in Burmah, are the occasion of the imprisonment and death of the heathen. Not long since in Burmah, an officer attached to the person of the King, and allied to him by natural bonds, forsook his gods and embraced the Christian religion. The King hearing this, commanded him to be seized and imprisoned, declaring that unless he renounced his faith in the Christian's God, he should be burnt with his household;—the officer persisted in worshipping the true God, and accordingly he was immolated.

In this case we plainly perceive how the missionaries might be the remote occasion of the destruction of this man. The missionary went among them, he saw their idolatry and abominations, he preached to them, distributed his tracts—the people read, were convicted of their impiety—they rose, determined to throw off this moral bondage—refused obedience to their King—on this account one is imprisoned and put to death. And what have abolitionists done? They have gone to the south, beheld the people doing that which they believed morally wrong—they have lifted up their voice against their sin—they have distributed their principles in the form of tracts and pamphlets, always inculcating the duty of submission and forbearance on the part of the slave—and, on the part of the slaveholder, the duty of letting the oppressed go free; and if the slave has come to a knowl-

edge of his state by the disseminating of truth, shall the promulgator of that truth be hung and gibbeted?—What has the abolitionist promulgated? Is it falsehood? Is it a falsehood that men are born free and equal? Is it a falsehood that slaves generally are treated like beasts? Is it a falsehood that the master is having that intercourse with his servant which is basely unbecoming a man and a Christian? Is it a falsehood that they now should break off their sins by righteousness, and turn from their evil course? If not, where, we ask, is the criminality in this dissemination of truth? If any man pretending to be an abolitionist, has in any way made known to the slave that he ought to rise up and murder his master, or any of his household, such an one is not an abolitionist, neither does he begin to understand their principles. No! we say to the slave, bear patiently your burden until the day of deliverance, if you cannot be freed without recourse to murder. We say to them in their bondage, return good for evil; but never, no, not for freedom, do that which is contrary to the Gospel of Christ. If those who are disseminating the principles above mentioned among the slaveholding states, are the cause of the misery alleged against them, and thus deservedly should be considered murderers and abettors of the same, then, on the same principles and method of argument, every minister of the gospel of Christ who is made the instrument of the salvation of a man, and that man because he will no longer join hand in hand with his household in their wickedness, and for this reason is disinherited and driven from his home, we say on the above method of reasoning, that Minister of Salvation is an enemy to his converts' best interest and should be a subject of his everlasting hatred.

As the cause of the destruction of Pharaoh and his hosts was in their sin against God, and not because the Israelites went before them through the red sea, so we believe the cause of those calamities which have already befallen the southern community is because they are making merchandise of that which God has expressly commanded they should not. And as God solemnly spoke by those plagues which came upon Egypt to let the Israelites go forth to worship the God of their fathers, so we also believe that he is also loudly speaking to our southern brethren by those calamities which have already come upon them, to break every yoke and let the oppressed go free. And as Pharaoh hardened his heart from the continual manifestations of God's displeasure against him, and thus increased their burdens by additional toil, so we fear the people at the south by new enactments of cruel and oppressive laws in addition to former ones, depriving free men of the privilege of reading the word of God, are imitating Pharaoh, and like him will be visited with still greater calamities, unless there is a disposition shown to render to God what his due.

Your committee will close this report by urging upon you to well consider for what you are contending, and who it is that is with you in this contention. They also would caution you not altogether to enter on this great work in your own strength. There is an Agent above necessary in this great matter, whose operations are mighty and who must be sought after by his creatures in all great and good performances. This work of emancipation is God's, in all its parts and all its glory, and the deepest humility is thus connected and blended with the highest confidence. Oh, cease not to offer up your petitions to His throne for wisdom to direct you and courage to perform—for you need all this. Let the fact, that the Almighty has entered the field before you in this cause, and that on his mighty arm the cause rests, cheer you onward, and although you cannot fellowship your southern brethren in their violation of what you think is the command of heaven, yet at all times exhibit toward them, and not only to them but all who differ from you, a spirit, not of bitter animosity and hatred, but of pity and love. The fact that God is a Sovereign is one which should encourage you. He has said, that 'he has declared the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that shall come forth, saying my counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure,' and we cannot but believe it is his pleasure that all men should be physically free. Yet from the consideration of this character of God's, we think that you cannot clear yourselves from the conviction that you should do whatsoever your hands find to do toward the completion of your wishes.

Preamble and Resolutions passed at the Annual Meeting of the Salisbury and Amesbury Anti-Slavery Society.

Believing free discussion to be the main spring, upon which depends all the movements of a Republic, we feel alarmed for our country, when we see popular frenzy rudely tearing from us this richest bequest of our forefathers. We feel called upon at this crisis to express our utter abhorrence of all efforts to check the free expression of opinion on all subjects. Therefore,

Resolved, That we look upon the suppression of free discussion, by brute force, as the first link in the iron chain of Despotism.

Resolved, That the course pursued by the Aristocrats of Boston, in creating a mob to break up the constitutional meeting of a society of ladies in broad daylight—attempting, and nearly taking the life of a most worthy citizen of Massachusetts, for fearlessly maintaining that 'all men are created free and equal' is a violation of the most sacred rights of American citizens; and deserves the reprobation of every free man.

Resolved, That the working men of Boston have set an example worthy the sons of their fathers; by keeping aloof from the respectable mobs which have disgraced that city.

Resolved, That it is the duty of every citizen of Mass. to withhold their support from those papers which directly or indirectly encourage mobs.

SAMUEL FIELDING, Sec'y.

BOSTON RECORDER.

MR. EDITOR.—In the Recorder of Feb. 5, Mr. Tracy tells us that Cousin's Psychology exposes a fault of method in Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding; which fault consists in "inquiring, first, whence our ideas are derived, and using the answer as a guide in deciding what our ideas are." Some writers on slavery—Mr. Tracy adds—have been led to the use of bad arguments by this same error. They suppose that whatever has its origin in a sinful act, is of necessity sinful, as if they should say that the relation of a father to an illegitimate son is a sinful relation, because it has its origin in a sinful act; that the exercise of parental care and authority over such a son is a continual breach of the seventh commandment; and that the relation, being sinful, ought to be immediately abolished. Slaveholders feel that there is sophistry in such reasoning. They know that the guilt of the original kidnappers cannot be justly imputed to them. They say, "We did not originate slavery. We found it existing, and if we do as well as we can with it, we are not to blame!" And this is a good answer to that argument! Take another course; examine slavery as it now is; compare slaveholding for profit with the "golden rule," and you get arguments against slavery which cannot be answered.

What a pity it is that Mr. T. cannot make it appear to others as plainly as it appears to himself—that he is a great man! Let the vulgar think as they may, he is evidently a very deep metaphysician: he goes to the bottom of things, and comes up—not clean. How ingeniously he apologizes for the slaveholders of the South in the above extract; how irretrievably he shows that the trivial circumstance of the original kidnapping of the slaves on the coast of Africa, has no bearing on the moral character of slaveholding as it now exists! And how beautifully, and pertinently he illustrates this point, by a reference to the unprincipled father and his bastard son! It is to be hoped that the slave-owners will not take it into their heads to forward a cargo of their "illegitimate sons" to Mr. T. as a reward for his metaphysical labors in behalf of slavery as it now is!

Mr. T. had something to say, not long since, about swinging on the same gallows with Mr. Garrison—provided Mr. Garrison would give his consent to such an arrangement! But does Mr. T. think that slaveholders wish to raise him to that high honor? Why should they? A more unflinching apologist they have not in New-England. Why should they wish to hang such a friend? If Mr. T. covets an upward lift from slaveholders, he must change his course; otherwise it is not probable that he will ever rise above the dirt.

Soon after Dr. Channing's book was published, Mr. T. expressed a very high opinion of it—if I mistake not, he stated, in substance, that there was nothing in the book to which he could particularly object—he thought it would be a rallying point for all those opponents of slavery (if) who could not conscientiously join the Anti-Slavery Society. I wish to direct Mr. Tracy's attention to a few passages in the Doctor's book, and ask the aid of his metaphysics in reconciling them with his own views as given above.

But if a human being cannot without infinite injustice be treated as property, then he cannot without equal wrong be used as such. The wrong in the first seizure lies in the destination of a human being to future bondage, to the criminal use of him as a chattel or brute. Can that very use which makes the original seizure wrong, become gradually innocent? Does the duration of wrong, the increase of it by continuance, convert it into right?

What a pity it is that Dr. Channing—poor man!—could not have read Cousin's Psychology before he wrote his book! And what a pity that Mr. Tracy could not have read it before he gave his opinion of the Doctor's work!

LETTER TO REV. MR. MAY.

[From a Clergyman in Connecticut.]

Dear Sir—Yours from Rhode Island, was received, in season; and with it the volume, 'Right and Wrong in Boston.' I am most thankful indeed for this little book, which I have perused with thrilling and varied emotion. Although in some parts rather peculiar in style, (a good proof of the independence of its origin,) it is as a whole a very able and satisfactory production. It will take Boston three years of reformed conduct to answer it. Nay, rather to admit and confirm it. Mrs. S., who is an older and warmer abolitionist than myself, is immeasurably delighted with the humble.

I can give my humble congratulations on the glorious and quiet meetings at Northampton, Boston and Providence, recently held. Rhode Island!—let her works praise her. Connecticut—shall she be the last refuge of oppression in New-England? I feel distressed beyond measure, (and I presume your own feelings cannot be less poignant,) that no general movement is made in Connecticut in favor of Abolition.

While tyranny is striving to wrest away our freedom (of speech and of the press), those who neglect, or delay action, will be responsible for the loss of liberty, if she be torn from us—nay, responsible whatever the result. And moreover, the diligent use of our liberty, (of speech and of the press,) while we have it, is the best and only successful means of preventing its irrevocable loss. Therefore I must act—and accordingly I have written to one minister to have a movement made towards a State Convention and Society, for Abolition. I hope it will go into good hands for arrangement and management.

Your obliged servant,

'RIGHT AND WRONG IN BOSTON.' This is the name of a pamphlet lately published by the Female Anti-Slavery Society in Boston, containing a detail of the unlawful proceedings and outrages committed there, during the last year, against the Abolitionists. Now the excitement is over, public sentiment strongly condemns the spirit of persecution so prevalent among even the most respectable members of society, and encouraged by some of the most respectable journals of that city, not many months since. If good can ever arise out of evil, it may be hoped that the tragic and unlawful scenes which were so lately enacted by mobs of all classes, all over the country, will bring the considerate and honest portion of our community to a full sense of the evil consequences of encouraging any species of persecution. The people have as much of a legal right to take an odious individual and hang him without trial, as they did in Vicksburg, as they have to tear and feather him, or to inflict the slightest corporal injury upon him. If the laws had no authority to stop the discussion of slavery, the people had no right to exercise any such authority without law.—Woomoock Advocate.

Right and Wrong in Boston.—A copy of this little work has been received, and from a cursory perusal of the same, we are led to believe its publication will effect much good. It bears a "living coals of fire" upon the heads of that gentlemanly mob, which assembled in Boston last October, to try their strength against that of women! We hope a copy will be placed in the hands of every friend to free discussion in the land.—Concord Freeman.

RIGHT AND WRONG IN BOSTON. We have just received this pamphlet, or rather volume, and have read many of its pages. A cause that can produce such a Report, is in no danger of being overthrown. We shall therefore notice it next month, but if our readers could know its value, a notice then would be useless. It would be in the hands of every one of them.—Emancipator.

'INCIDENTARY PAPER RETURNED.'—This is the label on the wrapper enclosing our 11th number, returned from the office of the Southern Baptist, Charleston, S. C. What then is an incidental paper? Any paper that exposes the sin of American Slavery! When the Telegraph enquires as to an 'incidental paper,' let it enquire to be.—Vt. Tel.

SLAVERY.

REPORT IN THE SENATE.

February 4, 1836.

Mr. Calhoun made the following Report:

The Select Committee to whom was referred that portion of the President's Message which relates to the attempts to circulate, through the mail, inflammatory appeals, to excite slaves to insurrection, submit the following report:

The committee fully concur with the President as to the character and tendency of the papers which have been attempted to be circulated in the south, through the mail, and participate with him in the indignation which he expresses at conduct so destructive of the peace and harmony of the country, and so repugnant to the Constitution and the dictates of humanity and religion. They also concur in the hope that, if the strong tone of disapprobation which the unconstitutional and wicked attempts have elicited forth does not arrest the non-slaveholding States will be prompt to exercise their power to suppress them as far as their authority extends. But, while they agree with the President as to the evil and its highly dangerous tendency, and the necessity of arresting it, they have not been able to assent to the measures of redress which he recommends—that Congress should pass a law prohibiting, under severe penalty, the transmission of incendiary publications through the mail, intended to instigate the slaves to insurrection.

After the most careful and deliberate investigation, they have been constrained to adopt the conclusion that Congress has not the power to pass such a law; that it would be a violation of one of the most sacred provisions of the Constitution and subversive of reserved powers essential to the preservation of the domestic institutions of the slaveholding States, and, with them, their peace and security. Concurring, as they do, with the President in the magnitude of the evil, and the necessity of its suppression, it would have been the cause of deep regret to the committee if they thought the difference of opinion, as to the right of Congress, would deprive the slaveholding States of any portion of the protection which the measure recommended by the President was intended to afford them. On the contrary they believe all the protection intended may be afforded, according to the views they take of the power of Congress without infringing on any provision of the constitution on one side, or the reserved rights of the States on the other.

The message, as has been stated, recommends that Congress should pass a law to punish the transmission, through the mail, of incendiary publications, intended to instigate the slaves to insurrection. It is of course assumed for Congress a right to determine what papers are incendiary and intended to excite insurrection. The question then is, has Congress such a right?—a question of vital importance to the slaveholding States, as will appear in the course of the discussion.

After examining this question with due deliberation, in all its bearings, the committee are of opinion, not only that Congress has not the right, but that it would be fatal to the States. Nothing is more clear than that the admission of the right, on the part of Congress, to determine what papers are incendiary, and, as such, to prohibit their circulation through the mail, necessarily involves the right to determine what are not incendiary, and to enforce their circulation. Nor is it less certain that to admit such a right would be virtually to clothe Congress with the power to abolish slavery, by giving it the means of breaking down the barriers which the slaveholding States have erected for the protection of their lives and property. It would give Congress, without regard to the prohibition laws of the States, the authority to open the gates to the flood of incendiary publications which are ready to break into those States, and to punish all who dare resist, as criminals. Fortunately Congress has no such right. The internal peace and security of the States are under the protection of the States themselves, to the entire exclusion of all authority and control on the part of Congress. It belongs to them, and not to Congress, to determine what is, or is not, calculated to disturb their peace and security; and of course, in the case under consideration, it belongs to the slaveholding States to determine what is incendiary and intended to incite to insurrection, and to adopt such defensive measures as may be necessary for their security, with unlimited means of carrying them into effect, except such as may be expressly prohibited to the States by the Constitution.

That the States which form our Federal Union are sovereign and independent communities, bound together by a constitutional compact, and are possessed of all the powers belonging to distinct and separate States, excepting such as are delegated to be exercised by the General Government, is assumed as unquestionable. The compact itself expressly provides that all powers, not delegated, are reserved to the States or to the people. To ascertain, then, whether the power in question is delegated or reserved, it is only necessary to ascertain whether it is to be found among the enumerated powers or not. If it be not among them, it belongs of course, to the reserved powers. On turning to the Constitution, it will be seen that, while the power of defending the country against external danger is found among the enumerated, the instrument is wholly silent as to the power of defending the States against internal danger, or the States, and of course, reserved to the States this important power, as it stood before the adoption of the Constitution, with no other limitations, as has been stated, except such as are expressly prescribed by the instrument itself. From what has been stated, it may be inferred that the right of a State to defend itself against internal dangers is a part of the great, primary, and inherent right of self-defence, which, by the laws of nature, belongs to all communities, and so belongs to the States of this essential right, without which their independence could not be preserved, that it is expressly provided by the Constitution that the General Government shall not assist a State, even in case of domestic violence, except on the application of the authorities of the State itself; thus excluding by a necessary consequence, its interference in all other cases.

Having now shown that it belongs to the slaveholding States, whose institutions are in danger, and not to Congress, as is supposed by the message, to determine what papers are incendiary, and intended to excite insurrection among the slaves, it remains to inquire, in the next place, what are the corresponding duties of the General Government, and the other States, from within whose limits and jurisdiction their institutions are attacked—a subject intimately connected with that which the committee are immediately charged with the duty of considering in the present juncture, ought to be fully understood by all the parties. The committee will begin with the first.

It may not be entirely useless to premise that rights and duties are reciprocal, the existence of a right always implying the corresponding duty. If, consequently, the right to protect her internal peace and security belongs to a State, the General Government is bound to respect the measures adopted by her for that purpose, and to co-operate in their execution, as far as its delegated powers may require, or the measure may require. Thus, in the present case, the slaveholding States having the unquestionable right to pass all such laws as may be necessary to maintain the existing relation between master and slave in those States, their right, of course, to prohibit the circulation of any publication, or any intercourse calculated to disturb or destroy that relation, is incontrovertible. In the execution of the measures which may be adopted by the States for this purpose, the powers of Congress over the mail, and of regulating commerce with foreign nations and between the States, may require co-operation on the part of the General Government; and it is bound in conformity to the principle established, to respect the laws of the State in their exercise, and to modify its acts as not only to violate those of the States, but, as far as practicable, to co-operate in their execution. The practice of the Government has been in conformity to these views.

By the act of March 3, 1803, entitled "An act to prevent the importation of certain persons into certain States," where, by the laws of those States, their importation is prohibited, Massachusetts, for instance, has been shown, and it may be added, to these views. The sober and considerate portions of citizens of

any section law, however severe its penalties. The mandate of the Government alone would be sufficient to close the door against circulation through the mail, and thus, at its sole will and pleasure, might intercept all communication between the press and the people; while it would require the intervention of courts and juries to enforce the provisions of the section law, in instances where it has shown any not always passive and willing instruments in the hands of Government, where the freedom of the press is concerned.

From these remarks, it must be apparent that to prohibit publication on one side, and circulation through the mail on the other, of any paper, on account of its religious, moral or political character, rests on the same principle, and that each is equally an abridgment of the freedom of the press, and a violation of the Constitution. It would indeed have been but a poor triumph for the cause of liberty, in the great contest of 1793, had the section law been put down on principles that would have left Congress free to suppress the circulation, through the mail, of the very publications which that odious act was intended to prohibit. The authors of that memorable achievement would have had but slender claims on the gratitude of posterity, if their victory over the encroachment of power had been left so imperfect.

It will, after what has been said, require but few remarks to show that the same principle which applied to the section law, would apply equally to a law punishing, by Congress, such incendiary publications as are referred to in the message, and, of course, to the passage of a law prohibiting their transmission through the mail. The principle on which the section act was condemned as unconstitutional, was a general one, and not limited in its application to that act. It withdraws from Congress all right of interference with the press, in any form or shape whatever; and the section law was put down as unconstitutional, not because it prohibited publications against the Government, but because it interfered, at all, with the press. The prohibition of any publication, on the ground of its being immoral, irreligious, or intended to excite rebellion or insurrection, would have been equally unconstitutional; and, from parity of reason, the suppression of their circulation through the mail would be no less so.

But, as conclusive as these reasons are against the right, there are others not less so, derived from the powers reserved to the States, which the committee will next proceed to consider.

The message, as has been stated, recommends that Congress should pass a law to punish the transmission, through the mail, of incendiary publications, intended to instigate the slaves to insurrection. It is of course assumed for Congress a right to determine what papers are incendiary and intended to excite insurrection. The question then is, has Congress such a right?—a question of vital importance to the slaveholding States, as will appear in the course of the discussion.

After examining this question with due deliberation, in all its bearings, the committee are of opinion, not only that Congress has not the right, but that it would be fatal to the States. Nothing is more clear than that the admission of the right, on the part of Congress, to determine what papers are incendiary, and, as such, to prohibit their circulation through the mail, necessarily involves the right to determine what are not incendiary, and to enforce their circulation. Nor is it less certain that to admit such a right would be virtually to clothe Congress with the power to abolish slavery, by giving it the means of breaking down the barriers which the slaveholding States have erected for the protection of their lives and property. It would give Congress, without regard to the prohibition laws of the States, the authority to open the gates to the flood of incendiary publications which are ready to break into those States, and to punish all who dare resist, as criminals. Fortunately Congress has no such right. The internal peace and security of the States are under the protection of the States themselves, to the entire exclusion of all authority and control on the part of Congress. It belongs to them, and not to Congress, to determine what is, or is not, calculated to disturb their peace and security; and of course, in the case under consideration, it belongs to the slaveholding States to determine what is incendiary and intended to incite to insurrection, and to adopt such defensive measures as may be necessary for their security, with unlimited means of carrying them into effect, except such as may be expressly prohibited to the States by the Constitution.

That the States which form our Federal Union are sovereign and independent communities, bound together by a constitutional compact, and are possessed of all the powers belonging to distinct and separate States, excepting such as are delegated to be exercised by the General Government, is assumed as unquestionable. The compact itself expressly provides that all powers, not delegated, are reserved to the States or to the people. To ascertain, then, whether the power in question is delegated or reserved, it is only necessary to ascertain whether it is to be found among the enumerated powers or not. If it be not among them, it belongs of course, to the reserved powers. On turning to the Constitution, it will be seen that, while the power of defending the country against external danger is found among the enumerated, the instrument is wholly silent as to the power of defending the States against internal danger, or the States, and of course, reserved to the States this important power, as it stood before the adoption of the Constitution, with no other limitations, as has been stated, except such as are expressly prescribed by the instrument itself. From what has been stated, it may be inferred that the right of a State to defend itself against internal dangers is a part of the great, primary, and inherent right of self-defence, which, by the laws of nature, belongs to all communities, and so belongs to the States of this essential right, without which their independence could not be preserved, that it is expressly provided by the Constitution that the General Government shall not assist a State, even in case of domestic violence, except on the application of the authorities of the State itself; thus excluding by a necessary consequence, its interference in all other cases.

Having now shown that it belongs to the slaveholding States, whose institutions are in danger, and not to Congress, as is supposed by the message, to determine what papers are incendiary, and intended to excite insurrection among the slaves, it remains to inquire, in the next place, what are the corresponding duties of the General Government, and the other States, from within whose limits and jurisdiction their institutions are attacked—a subject intimately connected with that which the committee are immediately charged with the duty of considering in the present juncture, ought to be fully understood by all the parties. The committee will begin with the first.

It may not be entirely useless to premise that rights and duties are reciprocal, the existence of a right always implying the corresponding duty. If, consequently, the right to protect her internal peace and security belongs to a State, the General Government is bound to respect the measures adopted by her for that purpose, and to co-operate in their execution, as far as its delegated powers may require, or the measure may require. Thus, in the present case, the slaveholding States having the unquestionable right to pass all such laws as may be necessary to maintain the existing relation between master and slave in those States, their right, of course, to prohibit the circulation of any publication, or any intercourse calculated to disturb or destroy that relation, is incontrovertible. In the execution of the measures which may be adopted by the States for this purpose, the powers of Congress over the mail, and of regulating commerce with foreign nations and between the States, may require co-operation on the part of the General Government; and it is bound in conformity to the principle established, to respect the laws of the State in their exercise, and to modify its acts as not only to violate those of the States, but, as far as practicable, to co-operate in their execution. The practice of the Government has been in conformity to these views.

By the act of March 3, 1803, entitled "An act to prevent the importation of certain persons into certain States," where, by the laws of those States, their importation is prohibited, Massachusetts, for instance, has been shown, and it may be added, to these views. The sober and considerate portions of citizens of

any section law, however severe its penalties. The mandate of the Government alone would be sufficient to close the door against circulation through the mail, and thus, at its sole will and pleasure, might intercept all communication between the press and the people; while it would require the intervention of courts and juries to enforce the provisions of the section law, in instances where it has shown any not always passive and willing instruments in the hands of Government, where the freedom of the press is concerned.

From these remarks, it must be apparent that to prohibit publication on one side, and circulation through the mail on the other, of any paper, on account of its religious, moral or political character, rests on the same principle, and that each is equally an abridgment of the freedom of the press, and a violation of the Constitution. It would indeed have been but a poor triumph for the cause of liberty, in the great contest of 1793, had the section law been put down on principles that would have left Congress free to suppress the circulation, through the mail, of the very publications which that odious act was intended to prohibit. The authors of that memorable achievement would have had but slender claims on the gratitude of posterity, if their victory over the encroachment of power had been left so imperfect.

It will, after what has been said, require but few remarks to show that the same principle which applied to the section law, would apply equally to a law punishing, by Congress, such incendiary publications as are referred to in the message, and, of course, to the passage of a law prohibiting their transmission through the mail. The principle on which the section act was condemned as unconstitutional, was a general one, and not limited in its application to that act. It withdraws from Congress all right of interference with the press, in any form or shape whatever; and the section law was put down as unconstitutional, not because it prohibited publications against the Government, but because it interfered, at all, with the press. The prohibition of any publication, on the ground of its being immoral, irreligious, or intended to excite rebellion or insurrection, would have been equally unconstitutional; and, from parity of reason, the suppression of their circulation through the mail would be no less so.

But, as conclusive as these reasons are against the right, there are others not less so, derived from the powers reserved to the States, which the committee will next proceed to consider.

The message, as has been stated, recommends that Congress should pass a law to punish the transmission, through the mail, of incendiary publications, intended to instigate the slaves to insurrection. It is of course assumed for Congress a right to determine what papers are incendiary and intended to excite insurrection. The question then is, has Congress such a right?—a question of vital importance to the slaveholding States, as will appear in the course of the discussion.

After examining this question with due deliberation, in all its bearings, the committee are of opinion, not only that Congress has not the right, but that it would be fatal to the States. Nothing is more clear than that the admission of the right, on the part of Congress, to determine what papers are incendiary, and, as such, to prohibit their circulation through the mail, necessarily involves the right to determine what are not incendiary, and to enforce their circulation. Nor is it less certain that to admit such a right would be virtually to clothe Congress with the power to abolish slavery, by giving it the means of breaking down the barriers which the slaveholding States have erected for the protection of their lives and property. It would give Congress, without regard to the prohibition laws of the States, the authority to open the gates to the flood of incendiary publications which are ready to break into those States, and to punish all who dare resist, as criminals. Fortunately Congress has no such right. The internal peace and security of the States are under the protection of the States themselves, to the entire exclusion of all authority and control on the part of Congress. It belongs to them, and not to Congress, to determine what is, or is not, calculated to disturb their peace and security; and of course, in the case under consideration, it belongs to the slaveholding States to determine what is incendiary and intended to incite to insurrection, and to adopt such defensive measures as may be necessary for their security, with unlimited means of carrying them into effect, except such as may be expressly prohibited to the States by the Constitution.

That the States which form our Federal Union are sovereign and independent communities, bound together by a constitutional compact, and are possessed of all the powers belonging to distinct and separate States, excepting such as are delegated to be exercised by the General Government, is assumed as unquestionable. The compact itself expressly provides that all powers, not delegated, are reserved to the States or to the people. To ascertain, then, whether the power in question is delegated or reserved, it is only necessary to ascertain whether it is to be found among the enumerated powers or not. If it be not among them, it belongs of course, to the reserved powers. On turning to the Constitution, it will be seen that, while the power of defending the country against external danger is found among the enumerated, the instrument is wholly silent as to the power of defending the States against internal danger, or the States, and of course, reserved to the States this important power, as it stood before the adoption of the Constitution, with no other limitations, as has been stated, except such as are expressly prescribed by the instrument itself. From what has been stated, it may be inferred that the right of a State to defend itself against internal dangers is a part of the great, primary, and inherent right of self-defence, which, by the laws of nature, belongs to all communities, and so belongs to the States of this essential right, without which their independence could not be preserved, that it is expressly provided by the Constitution that the General Government shall not assist a State, even in case of domestic violence, except on the application of the authorities of the State itself; thus excluding by a necessary consequence, its interference in all other cases.

Having now shown that it belongs to the slaveholding States, whose institutions are in danger, and not to Congress, as is supposed by the message, to determine what papers are incendiary, and intended to excite insurrection among the slaves, it remains to inquire, in the next place, what are the corresponding duties of the General Government, and the other States, from within whose limits and jurisdiction their institutions are attacked—a subject intimately connected with that which the committee are immediately charged with the duty of considering in the present juncture, ought to be fully understood by all the parties. The committee will begin with the first.

It may not be entirely useless to premise that rights and duties are reciprocal, the existence of a right always implying the corresponding duty. If, consequently, the right to protect her internal peace and security belongs to a State, the General Government is bound to respect the measures adopted by her for that purpose, and to co-operate in their execution, as far as its delegated powers may require, or the measure may require. Thus, in the present case, the slaveholding States having the unquestionable right to pass all such laws as may be necessary to maintain the existing relation between master and slave in those States, their right, of course, to prohibit the circulation of any publication, or any intercourse calculated to disturb or destroy that relation, is incontrovertible. In the execution of the measures which may be adopted by the States for this purpose, the powers of Congress over the mail, and of regulating commerce with foreign nations and between the States, may require co-operation on the part of the General Government; and it is bound in conformity to the principle established, to respect the laws of the State in their exercise, and to modify its acts as not only to violate those of the States, but, as far as practicable, to co-operate in their execution. The practice of the Government has been in conformity to these views.

By the act of March 3, 1803, entitled "An act to prevent the importation of certain persons into certain States," where, by the laws of those States, their importation is prohibited, Massachusetts, for instance, has been shown, and it may be added, to these views. The sober and considerate portions of citizens of

any section law, however severe its penalties. The mandate of the Government alone would be sufficient to close the door against circulation through the mail, and thus, at its sole will and pleasure, might intercept all communication between the press and the people; while it would require the intervention of courts and juries to enforce the provisions of the section law, in instances where it has shown any not always passive and willing instruments in the hands of Government, where the freedom of the press is concerned.

From these remarks, it must be apparent that to prohibit publication on one side, and circulation through the mail on the other, of any paper, on account of its religious, moral or political character, rests on the same principle, and that each is equally an abridgment of the freedom of the press, and a violation of the Constitution. It would indeed have been but a poor triumph for the cause of liberty, in the great contest of 1793, had the section law been put down on principles that would have left Congress free to suppress the circulation, through the mail, of the very publications which that odious act was intended to prohibit. The authors of that memorable achievement would have had but slender claims on the gratitude of posterity, if their victory over the encroachment of power had been left so imperfect.

It will, after what has been said, require but few remarks to show that the same principle which applied to the section law, would apply equally to a law punishing, by Congress, such incendiary publications as are referred to in the message, and, of course, to the passage of a law prohibiting their transmission through the mail. The principle on which the section act was condemned as unconstitutional, was a general one, and not limited in its application to that act. It withdraws from Congress all right of interference with the press, in any form or shape whatever; and the section law was put down as unconstitutional, not because it prohibited publications against the Government, but because it interfered, at all, with the press. The prohibition of any publication, on the ground of its being immoral, irreligious, or intended to excite rebellion or insurrection, would have been equally unconstitutional; and, from parity of reason, the suppression of their circulation through the mail would be no less so.

But, as conclusive as these reasons are against the right, there are others not less so, derived from the powers reserved to the States, which the committee will next proceed to consider.

The message, as has been stated, recommends that Congress should pass a law to punish the transmission, through the mail, of incendiary publications, intended to instigate the slaves to insurrection. It is of course assumed for Congress a right to determine what papers are incendiary and intended to excite insurrection. The question then is, has Congress such a right?—a question of vital importance to the slaveholding States, as will appear in the course of the discussion.

After examining this question with due deliberation, in all its bearings, the committee are of opinion, not only that Congress has not the right, but that it would be fatal to the States. Nothing is more clear than that the admission of the right, on the part of Congress, to determine what papers are incendiary, and, as such, to prohibit their circulation through the mail, necessarily involves the right to determine what are not incendiary, and to enforce their circulation. Nor is it less certain that to admit such a right would be virtually to clothe Congress with the power to abolish slavery, by giving it the means of breaking down the barriers which the slaveholding States have erected for the protection of their lives and property. It would give Congress, without regard to the prohibition laws of the States, the authority to open the gates to the flood of incendiary publications which are ready to break into those States, and to punish all who dare resist, as criminals. Fortunately Congress has no such right. The internal peace and security of the States are under the protection of the States themselves, to the entire exclusion of all authority and control on the part of Congress. It belongs to them, and not to Congress, to determine what is, or is not, calculated to disturb their peace and security; and of course, in the case under consideration, it belongs to the slaveholding States to determine what is incendiary and intended to incite to insurrection, and to adopt such defensive measures as may be necessary for their security, with unlimited means of carrying them into effect, except such as may be expressly prohibited to the States by the Constitution.

That the States which form our Federal Union are sovereign and independent communities, bound together by a constitutional compact, and are possessed of all the powers belonging to distinct and separate States, excepting such as are delegated to be exercised by the General Government, is assumed as unquestionable. The compact itself expressly provides that all powers, not delegated, are reserved to the States or to the people. To ascertain, then, whether the power in question is delegated or reserved, it is only necessary to ascertain whether it is to be found among the enumerated powers or not. If it be not among them, it belongs of course, to the reserved powers. On turning to the Constitution, it will be seen that, while the power of defending the country against external danger is found among the enumerated, the instrument is wholly silent as to the power of defending the States against internal danger, or the States, and of course, reserved to the States this important power, as it stood before the adoption of the Constitution, with no other limitations, as has been stated, except such as are expressly prescribed by the instrument itself. From what has been stated, it may be inferred that the right of a State to defend itself against internal dangers is a part of the great, primary, and inherent right of self-defence, which, by the laws of nature, belongs to all communities, and so belongs to the States of this essential right, without which their independence could not be preserved, that it is expressly provided by the Constitution that the General Government shall not assist a State, even in case of domestic violence, except on the application of the authorities of the State itself; thus excluding by a necessary consequence, its interference in all other cases.

Having now shown that it belongs to the slaveholding States, whose institutions are in danger, and not to Congress, as is supposed by the message, to determine what papers are incendiary, and intended to excite insurrection among the slaves, it remains to inquire, in the next place, what are the corresponding duties of the General Government, and the other States, from within whose limits and jurisdiction their institutions are attacked—a subject intimately connected with that which the committee are immediately charged with the duty of considering in the present juncture, ought to be fully understood by all the parties. The committee will begin with the first.

It may not be entirely useless to premise that rights and duties are reciprocal, the existence of a right always implying the corresponding duty. If, consequently, the right to protect her internal peace and security belongs to a State, the General Government is bound to respect the measures adopted by her for that purpose, and to co-operate in their execution, as far as its delegated powers may require, or the measure may require. Thus, in the present case, the slaveholding States having the unquestionable right to pass all such laws as may be necessary to maintain the existing relation between master and slave in those States, their right, of course, to prohibit the circulation of any publication, or any intercourse calculated to disturb or destroy that relation, is incontrovertible. In the execution of the measures which may be adopted by the States for this purpose, the powers of Congress over the mail, and of regulating commerce with foreign nations and between the States, may require co-operation on the part of the General Government; and it is bound in conformity to the principle established, to respect the laws of the State in their exercise, and to modify its acts as not only to violate those of the States, but, as far as practicable, to co-operate in their execution. The practice of the Government has been in conformity to these views.

By the act of March 3, 1803, entitled "An act to prevent the importation of certain persons into certain States," where, by the laws of those States, their importation is prohibited, Massachusetts, for instance, has been shown, and it may be added, to these views. The sober and considerate portions of citizens of

any section law, however severe its penalties. The mandate of the Government alone would be sufficient to close the door against circulation through the mail, and thus, at its sole will and pleasure, might intercept all communication between the press and the people; while it would require the intervention of courts and juries to enforce the provisions of the section law, in instances where it has shown any not always passive and willing instruments in the hands of Government, where the freedom of the press is concerned.

From these remarks, it must be apparent that to prohibit publication on one side, and circulation through the mail on the other, of any paper, on account of its religious, moral or political character, rests on the same principle, and that each is equally an abridgment of the freedom of the press, and a violation of the Constitution. It would indeed have been but a poor triumph for the cause of liberty, in the great contest of 1793, had the section law been put down on principles that would have left Congress free to suppress the circulation, through the mail, of the very publications which that odious act was intended to prohibit. The authors of that memorable achievement would have had but slender claims on the gratitude of posterity, if their victory over the encroachment of power had been left so imperfect.

It will, after what has been said, require but few remarks to show that the same principle which applied to the section law, would apply equally to a law punishing, by Congress, such incendiary publications as are referred to in the message, and, of course, to the passage of a law prohibiting their transmission through the mail. The principle on which the section act was condemned as unconstitutional, was a general one, and not limited in its application to that act. It withdraws from Congress all right of interference with the press, in any form or shape whatever; and the section law was put down as unconstitutional, not because it prohibited publications against the Government, but because it interfered, at all, with the press. The prohibition of any publication, on the ground of its being immoral, irreligious, or intended to excite rebellion or insurrection, would have been equally unconstitutional; and, from parity of reason, the suppression of their circulation through the mail would be no less so.

But, as conclusive as these reasons are against the right, there are others not less so, derived from the powers reserved to the States, which the committee will next proceed to consider.

The message, as has been stated, recommends that Congress should pass a law to punish the transmission, through the mail, of incendiary publications, intended to instigate the slaves to insurrection. It is of course assumed for Congress a right to determine what papers are incendiary and intended to excite insurrection. The question then is, has Congress such a right?—a question of vital importance to the slaveholding States, as will appear in the course of the discussion.

A SORT OF DEFECTION.

The Vermont Chronicle has taken upon its guardianship the Rev. Rufus W. Bailey, a northern-born pro-slavery preacher, who has published a great deal of Jesuitism in the Maine Christian Mirror, and has for that matter been handled much as he deserved to be by the Liberator. The Chronicle thinks the call upon the Liberator very unchristian, and calls upon the Liberator to withdraw its countenance from the Liberator. In reply to his call, he has caught one man—Rev. Chester Wright. Mr. Wright says, as quoted in the Liberator, "as quoted in the Liberator, as it stands there. But in his short letter, Mr. W. travels a great way out of the record—so we give the whole."

[From the Vermont Chronicle.]

Messrs. Editors—In accordance with your suggestion relative to the duty of Christians who are members of the Anti-Slavery Society, I hereby declare my utter abhorrence of the language used by the Liberator, respecting the Rev. R. W. Bailey, as quoted in your paper, and also the sentiments quoted from the Liberator, respecting civil government. And from the Liberator, I disclaim all fellowship with that paper. I wish it also to be understood, that although I have become a member of the Anti-Slavery Society, and a firm believer in its doctrines in opposition to slavery, I cherish an affectionate regard to the Colonization Society, and shall endeavor, as I may be able, to promote its important interests. My views in relation to colonization have been fully exposed in the three last reports of the Vermont Colonization Society.

C. WRIGHT.

Montpelier, January 27, 1836.

If the members of Anti-Slavery Societies were responsible for Mr. Garrison's sentiments, there might be some propriety in their disclaiming those 'respecting civil government.' But woe to the patrons of the Chronicle, and to its subscription list too, if patrons are responsible for the language of their editor, and are bound to disclaim, &c.

Mr. Garrison is patronized by the anti-slavery societies, just as any other man is not because he is foolish, but because his labors do, and are honestly designed to do good.

We owe some thanks, however, to the Chronicle. We hope it will call off from the anti-slavery ranks all such men as Mr. Wright. People who are so good natured as to 'promote the important interests' of their enemies, will never do for the abolitionists. There is no such thing as being on both sides in this matter. If the anti-slavery societies of Vermont have not yet learned this, we seriously advise them to set about the perusal of Jay's Inquiry, Garrison's Thoughts, or the African Repository—Emancipator.

[From the New-England Gazette.]

ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING.

In accordance with public notice, a meeting of citizens favorable to the formation of a YOUNG MEN'S ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY in this town, was held on Friday evening, 19th inst., at the Lyceum.

David Mack was called to the chair, and Henry W. Lee was appointed Secretary.

The meeting was first addressed by the Chairman, who set forth the object of the call, and was succeeded by Joseph Congdon, who presented the following resolution which was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That those individuals whose names are subscribed to the call which has convened us, associate themselves under the name of the New-England Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society, auxiliary to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

The above resolution was supported by John Burge, James B. Congdon, H. W. Lee, Sidney Underwood, D. H. Armstrong, and John Lord.

An opportunity was then given to those present who were desirous to join the association, and twenty individuals gave their names in addition to those who had already evinced such a desire by signing the call for the meeting.

It was voted, That a Committee of five be appointed to prepare a Constitution for the Society, and nominate a list of Officers; and that they report their doings at an adjournment of this meeting—to be notified by the Chairman of the Committee.

J. B. Congdon, John F. Emerson, John Lord, B. T. Sanford, and S. Underwood, were constituted said Committee.

[From the N. Y. Courier & Enquirer of Feb. 19.]

NEGRO INSURRECTION.

The following account received by the Philadelphia Rail Road line yesterday afternoon, taken from the Commercial Herald caused considerable sensation in the city. It will be perceived by the communications made to us through our Express, that it is without any foundation.

HIGHLY IMPORTANT!

Just as our paper was going to press last night, we were favored with the following letter, containing an account of an INSURRECTION OF THE SLAVES AT NASHVILLE, Tennessee, and the DESTRUCTION OF THE PLANTERS' BANK AND THE UNION BANK OF TENNESSEE. We shall wait for further particulars with great anxiety.

Three miles from NASHVILLE, Feb. 10, 6 o'clock, P. M.

Dear Sir,—We have just time to inform you by Mr. Harris, who is leaving here for Nashville, that Nashville is in the utmost consternation, owing to an INSURRECTION OF THE SLAVES. At 1 o'clock the Planter's Bank was FORCED into—have not heard the particulars. If we save our lives, it is all we ask.

We remain truly,

J. & R. YEATMAN & CO.

HALF-PAST 6, P. M.

P. S.—An express has just arrived—THE UNION BANK WAS BURNED LAST NIGHT.

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 19, 1836.—12 noon.

Col. Webb—Dear Sir: I must also draw your attention to a letter published in the Commercial Herald, giving an account of insurrection among the slaves at Nashville, Tenn. &c.; this is all no doubt a villainous forgery. The letter has been shown this morning, and is not recognized as Messrs. Yeatman's hand-writing, but is evidently a disguised hand. It is addressed J. Smith, Esq. Philadelphia, postmarked Mayville, Ky., Feb. 13, whereas Col. Page, our Postmaster, states, the mail of 12th is only due to-night, and besides it is postmarked in writing, and they always use a stamp as all large offices do. I leave you, Sir, to make your own remarks, which are due to counteract this villainous, and it may prove injurious forgery.

Mr. Sergeant of the Herald, has handed me the notice which I enclose in this letter.

The letter published in the Commercial Herald this morning, purporting to be from Yeatman & Co. Nashville, I have reason to believe is a forgery.

N. SARGENT.

Feb. 19, 1836.

1000 DOLLARS REWARD.

WE, the subscribers, agree to pay a pro rata proportion of One Thousand Dollars to discover the author of the letter published this day in the Commercial Herald.

THOS. BIDDLE & CO. C. & G. M. HICKLING, S. M. ALLEN, WM. M. WALMSLEY, JOHN A. BROWN & CO. HENRY R. DAVIS, R. J. PHILLIPS, LEWIS DEVAL, JACKSON, RIDDLE & CO. H. NIXON, ELIUS CHANCEY, C. W. & J. R. SMITH, C. MACALESTER, CLEMAN FISHER. Philadelphia, Feb. 19th, 1836.

MORE LYNCH LAW.

The Southern Telegraph contains an article, dated Rodney, Miss. Jan. 15, notifying another instance of summary punishment, which occurred at Fayette, on the night of the previous Saturday. It appears that a man named Spinney, was con-

finned in the jail for the murder of a Mr. McGowan. His trial which was brought up at the previous term of the Circuit Court was postponed on account of some informality in the indictment, in consequence of which he was remanded to prison to await his trial at the next session of the court. But the process of the law was too slow for the citizens of Fayette, and they resolved to anticipate the verdict of justice. Accordingly, they went en masse, and having been refused the keys by the keeper, they broke their way into the jail with sledge-hammers—seized the unfortunate wretch, and hung him instantly.

As an excuse for the outrage, it is alleged that Spinney had been heard to say, that if an opportunity was ever given him, he would with undying revenge follow up all who had been instrumental in his conviction. The miserable man may have been treble guilty—but then by these laws alone should he have been punished.

How long will the people of Mississippi continue to disgrace the state—the nation, and the age! Already have their acts reached the shores of Europe, where they are cited by the enemies of free institutions, as an argument against the system of self-government—and as a proof of the barbarity of this, the Southern Telegraph very properly remarks—

'We must say that the manner and method of bringing such men to justice as now pursued, will ultimately lead to consequences the extent of which we cannot calculate. The innocent will suffer with the guilty—our towns will be laid waste by the torch of the incendiary, and our lives endangered by the revengeful murderer or the defeated gambler.'

BOSTON.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1836.

CHANNING ON SLAVERY.

The second edition of this work, 'revised,' has just made its appearance. A few more pages have been added, but there is no improvement in the volume, on the score of consistency or fairness. We have abstained from reviewing it, and waited very patiently to get the revised copy of a second edition, as the rumor was prevalent, that many important alterations were to be made, particularly favorable to the abolitionists; and we therefore chose to be late in our review, rather than hasty in our censure. All the offensive allusions to, and unmerited charges against, the advocates of immediate and everlasting emancipation, are exactly reiterated in their original shape.—The Dr. is true, no longer endorses Kaufman's slander of that noble advocate of non-resistance and liberty, Geo. Thompson, as the affidavits of Messrs. Sunderland, Phelps and Gregg have been published since he committed that error; but, instead of confessing the injustice he has done to Mr. T., he merely refrains from renewing the defamatory accusation? Is this magnanimous? Is it doing as he would be done by?

Some of our abolition brethren are inclined to think, that the work, with all its errors, is worthy of extensive circulation, and even of panegyric. We do not agree with them in this opinion. Some portions of the work, we admit, are full of eloquence and truth: those are mere repetitions of the views and sentiments of the abolitionists. But whatever is valuable in it, is entirely neutralized by a strong admixture of error. It is a work in active collision with itself. At the onset, its points are skillfully sharpened, so as to pierce through the joints and marrow of the monster Slavery; but they are soon purposely blunted and broken, or rather turned against the assailant himself. It is not enough to say, that the work has some defects—its errors are radical. If abolitionists are disposed to commend it, merely because it contains some excellent sentiments, and is written by Dr. Channing, then they may not scruple to approve of other works that are inimical to themselves, which are not wholly destitute of merit. Reserving our criticisms for another occasion, and in another shape, we shall now merely allude to a few particulars, in which, as abolitionists, we deprecate the work, as being calculated, in the present corrupt state of the public mind, to do more harm than good.

1. The chapter of 'Explanations' ought to be styled a chapter in 'Recantation.'

2. The Dr. purports to show that slavery is wrong, but does not intend to pass sentence on the character of the slaveholder—'O no!'

3. The Dr. concedes, that the establishment of martial law and a dictator may sometimes be justified by public danger. What does the gospel of Jesus Christ know of a dictator or martial law?

4. The Dr. asserts, that 'the slave virtually suffers the wrong of robbery, though with utter unconscientiousness on the part of those who inflict it!'

5. The Dr. virtually declares, that the standard erected for human judgment and estimation by Jesus Christ, 'by their fruits ye shall know them,' is arbitrary and unjust. He says that the character of the master, and the wrong done to the slave, are distinct points, having little or no relation to each other! 'Men are not always to be interpreted by their acts or their institutions.' 'Our ancestors committed a deed now branded as piracy. Were they, therefore, the offspring of the earth? But were they not pirates in kidnapping the Africans? 'How many seats have persecuted and shed blood! Were they members, therefore, monsters of depravity? Were they the followers of Jesus Christ? Was not their spirit cruel and devilish? According to the Dr.'s theory, a few centuries ago, theft, adultery, persecution, oppression, and murder, were offences quite venial!

6. The Dr. maintains, that 'there are masters who hold the slave chiefly, if not wholly, from disinterested motives; and these deserve great praise.' They deplore and abhor the institution; but, believing that partial emancipation, in the present condition of society, would bring untold evil on bond and free, they think themselves bound to continue the relation, until it shall be dissolved by comprehensive and systematic measures of the State! What a delightful lullaby to put conscience to sleep, and comfort oppressors! And this is a book, forsooth, to abolish slavery! Why, the foregoing quotation alone is a milestone about the neck of exhausted Liberty.

7. The Dr. says, that 'the influence of slavery is still blighting, though conscientiously upheld.' Is this a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man?

8. The Dr. thinks, that 'among despots, there have been good men.' Why not among robbers and whoremongers? Is despotism in any shape reconcilable with the spirit of Christ? If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his!

9. The Dr. asserts, that 'there is here an increasing disposition to multiply the comforts of the slaves.' Where is the evidence of it?

10. The Dr. declares, 'that cruelty is not the habit of the slave States of this country.' Most extraordinary declaration! He might as truly affirm, that idolatry is not the habit of pagan countries. What is cruelty? Hear what the Dr. says of the slave on page 26:—'The sacrifice of such a being to another's will, to another's present, outward, ill-comprehended good, is the greatest violence which can be offered to any creature of God. It is to degrade him from his rank in the universe, to make him a means, not an end; to cast him out from God's spiritual family into the brutal herd.' 'No robbery is so great as that to which the slave is habitually subjected.' 'The slave must meet CRUEL TREATMENT, either inwardly or outwardly. Either the soul or the body must receive the blow. Either the flesh must be tortured, or the spirit be struck down.' And yet the Dr. opines, that cruelty is not the habit of the slave States!

11. The Dr. says—'It is not of the particular form of slavery in this country that I complain! I am willing to

allow that it is here comparatively mild (!)—that on many plantations, no abuses exist—but such are inseparable from its very nature.'—But we have quoted the Dr. above as saying, that, by its very nature, 'either the flesh must be tortured, or the spirit be struck down.' How mild it is, 'comparatively!'

12. The Dr. says, that 'the slave should not, in the first instance, be allowed to wander at his will beyond the plantation on which he toils.' To destroy the right of locomotion is one of the most intolerable aspects of slavery. Strange freedom this! 'It would be cruelty to strike the fetters from a man, whose first steps would infallibly lead him to a precipice.' Is freedom to a guiltless, sane man, liberated from bondage, to be likened to a precipice? Look to the West Indies, to Antigua and Bermuda, and tell us how many have fallen or perished by instant, unconditional emancipation!

13. The Dr. says, that 'the great step towards the removal of slaves is to prepare the slaves for self-support.' Emancipation, and that alone is preparation. 'In case of being injured by his master, [so, it seems, his dear old master is to have him under his control!] in any respect, he should either be set free, [but the Dr. says elsewhere that slavery is the greatest of all injuries!] or, if unprepared for liberty (!) should be transferred to another guardian.' 'It is agreed that he will be fit for freedom, as soon as the support of his family shall become his habit and his happiness.' What a foundation upon which to base a man's rights to liberty!

14. The Dr. is still for gradualism. 'No measure for preparing the slave for liberty can be so effectual as the improvement of his domestic lot! Yet in another place, the Dr. says that 'the slave has no family to call his own! Again—'Slavery virtually dissolves the domestic relations. It ruptures the most sacred ties on earth. It violates home. It lacerates the best affections.' 'The slave's home does not merit the name.' Put this and that together. Again—'Religious instruction should go hand in hand with all other means for preparing the slave for freedom.' 'I have not intended to say that emancipation is an easy work, the work of a day! Ah! Dr. where is to-morrow? God says—NOW!'

15. The Dr. says, that the abolitionists, in sending their pamphlets into the slaveholding States, have 'acted weakly and without decorum! Pray, who should read these pamphlets, if not those for whom they were written? Does the Dr. mean to prohibit the circulation of his book at the south?

16. The Dr. says, that the charge of fanaticism against the abolitionists he has no desire to repel! And what is a fanatic? WALKER defines the term thus: 'Fanatic, an enthusiast, a man mad with violent notions.' What comedy on the part of the Dr. to brand such men as Jay, Tappan, Birney, Smith, &c. &c. as men who are at least partially, if not wholly, wild or insane!

17. The Dr. says, that the abolitionists 'have fallen into the common error of enthusiasts, that of exaggerating their object, of feeling as if no evil existed but that which they opposed.' This is a slander, in support of which no evidence is or can be produced. They have never represented slavery in more terrific features than the Dr. has drawn himself. Never!

18. The Dr. denounces the tone of the abolition newspapers as having often been 'fierce, bitter, and abusive,' 'unfriendly both to manners and to the spirit of our religion! Where would have been the anti-slavery cause, had it not been for these newspapers?

19. The Dr. says, that one of the errors of the abolitionists 'has been the adoption of immediate emancipation as their motto.' So say colonizationists and slaveholders. The error has proved the salvation of our cause.

20. The Dr. says, that we ought to exclude colored persons from the anti-slavery societies. So say Prejudice, Hatred, & Co. and the slaveholders.

21. The Dr. says, that these societies ought to be disbanded. So says George McDuffie, in the name of the south!

22. The Dr. beseeches abolitionists to cease from their work of 'regitation.' So do the slaveholders. What agitation is Dr. C. himself creating in the public mind by his book!

23. The Dr. says, (and how idly, nay, how presumptuously, in view of the unparalleled growth of the anti-slavery cause, and of sympathy and zeal for the oppressed,) that 'nothing seems to have been gained,—perhaps something has been lost to the cause of freedom and humanity,' by the labors and writings of the abolitionists! 'O, lame and impotent conclusion! But the slaveholders agree with the Dr.

24. The Dr. slanderously affirms, that 'the abolitionists proposed, indeed, to convert the slaveholders; and for this end, he approached them with civility, and exhausted on them the vocabulary of abuse.' And he has reaped as he sowed! That is to say, riots and mobs are the rational fruits of the doctrines of the abolitionists!

25. The Dr. kindly informs us, that 'the abolitionists might have formed an association; but it should have been an elective one!—i. e. made up of the good-society folks! So says the American Union.

Here we have pointed out twenty-five objections to Dr. Channing's work, which show that it is utterly destitute of any redeeming, reforming power—that it is calumnious, contradictory and unsound—and that it ought not to be appropriated by any genuine abolitionist. 'He that is not with us is against us.'

BOSTON YOUNG MEN'S ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of this Society was held at the Hall, 46 Washington-street, on Monday evening last. The meeting was addressed by Rev. S. J. May, Geo. S. Hilliard, Geo. L. Leflow, and Alfred Norton. Facts were also stated by Messrs. Porter and Ela.

Much interest was excited, and the Society concluded to resume its debates as they were conducted last year. The first meeting for discussion will be held at the Hall, 46 Washington-street, next Thursday evening at 7 o'clock. The public generally are invited to attend and participate in the debate.

At the meeting, the following officers were chosen for the year ensuing:

President—J. V. HIMES.

Vice President—C. C. BARRY.

Corresponding Secretary—W. W. BROWN.

Recording Secretary—S. O. TORREY.

Treasurer—JOHN S. KIMBALL.

Managers—

J. C. WHITE, N. SOUTHWICK,

ISAAC FIELD, JOSEPH TILSON,

ROSWELL GOSB.

PROTESTANT POPE. The Southern Religious Telegraph says that 'the effectual means to save the slaves from imbibing the spirit of fierce fanaticism, [i. e. liberty] is to teach them orally the doctrines of the Gospel,—that religion requires them to love God supremely, and to be faithful and obedient as the servants of men.'

This is the same pious sheet which said some time ago, that 'teaching black people to read the Bible will make Christians of very few of them (!) If Christian masters were to teach their servants to read, we apprehend that they would not feel the obligation as they ought to feel it, of giving them oral instruction, and often impressing divine truth upon their minds (!) If the free colored people were generally taught to read, it might be an inducement to them to remain in this country (!) WE WOULD OFFER THEM NO SUCH INDUCEMENT (!) This Religious Telegraph is very much alarmed lest popery should gain ground in our country!

A GAG LAW has been introduced into the Legislature of Rhode Island, by one whose name may henceforth be coupled with Benedict Arnold, and who is resolved to run 'the hazard of the die,' viz. BENJAMIN HAZARD. The consideration of it has been postponed to the May session.

KENTUCKY. We have endeavored to lay before our readers, as fast as we could find room, all the denunciations of the anti-slavery cause which have abounded in the late annual messages of sundry Governors, both at the north and south. We believe the Governor of Maine is the only one among the number, who has not subjected himself to ridicule or infamy by alluding to the subject—for he makes no mention of it in his message. All that Gov. Morehead of Kentucky says, respecting the abolitionists, is contained in the following paragraph:

'The feelings of the nation have, of late, been awakened by the unauthorized movements of certain abolition societies, intended to disturb the institution of slavery in the slaveholding states. I do not propose, in this place, to argue the propriety or the impropriety of that institution, or of the relations which it creates. But we can admit no question of its inviolability so long as it is an acknowledged principle finding a guarantee for its security in our federal compact, and we must prepare ourselves to resist, from whatever quarter they may proceed, any assaults upon it. I am not informed that the incendiary efforts alluded to have extended to Kentucky, but whether they have or not, I think it proper to advise that the sense of the Legislature should be distinctly expressed of these obnoxious and alarming movements, and that our statutory regulations upon the subject should undergo your close examination, in order that if the rights and interests of our fellow citizens should be found to require any additional protection, that protection may be afforded.'

We must tell Gov. Morehead, (would that he had more heart!) that he is begging the question as to the 'inviolability' of the institution of slavery, so long as he declines 'arguing the propriety or the impropriety of that institution, or of the relations which it creates.' We deny that our movements are 'unauthorized,' either by the 'federal compact,' or by the constitution of the slave states. Justice, Humanity, Liberty, Religion, not only authorize but require them, and we shall not abandon them—any old or new 'statutory regulations' to the contrary notwithstanding. We would recommend, for his perusal and enlightenment, the late masterly letter upon the subject of slavery, of a distinguished citizen of Kentucky—JAMES G. BIRNEY.

The only comment which the Cincinnati Journal (a colonization print) makes upon the above extract is, that 'it is much more dignified than the rant of Gov. McDuffie.' But is it more acceptable?

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT.

The Fourth Annual Report of the Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, is a document of peculiar ability and value, and breathes an excellent spirit. Some extracts hereafter. We trust it will be circulated widely—very widely. Accompanying it are the speeches of Prof. Follen and William Goodell, reported at length; both so truly admirable, that they claim to be read and preserved by every lover of human freedom and equal rights. There is also an ingenious disquisition upon the U. S. Constitution, by Rev. Mr. Grosvenor.

The poetical effusion of F. H. W. is thankfully received, and shall be inserted in our next number.

NEWS OF THE DAY.

THE FLORIDA WAR.

You have doubtless seen, by the papers, that Florida is engaged in a bloody war with the Seminole Indians—the most savage and ferocious of their race. It is more than two months since the commencement of Indian hostilities. The war has grown out of the attempt of the Government to remove them beyond the Mississippi. A treaty was concluded three years ago, with the principal Chiefs, who agreed to remove to their new home about the 8th of January. It was then believed that the whole tribe would finally consent to go peacefully. But in this all have been disappointed. The most intelligent chief was murdered by Powell, the present master-spirit of the tribe, because he was in favor of removal, according to the stipulations of the treaty. Since that time, the Indians have been constantly engaged in plundering, burning, and murdering the white inhabitants all over the territory. The people have fled from their plantations and homes scattered over the country, and have, many of them, come to this city for safety. Their houses, furniture, provisions, cattle, hogs, poultry, ponies, and large quantities of sugar and sugarcane, and cotton, have been burnt, or taken by the Indians for their own use. The property thus destroyed on some plantations, was valued at \$130,000. As many as 130 negroes have also been taken from a single plantation, and pressed into the service of the Indians, whose warriors are said to amount to 2500—and if the Creek Indians of Georgia join the Seminoles, as is expected, the united force of the two tribes will probably exceed 4,000 fighting men. By the last accounts, 500 Creeks were in motion, committing depredations in Georgia. The main body of the Seminoles are supposed to be in a large swamp, almost inaccessible to the whites, while small parties of twenty, thirty, and even 120, are roving about the country, burning property, and shooting and scalping every white man who comes in their way. There is no safety in travelling, and people do not think of leaving for a few miles, except in companies of fifteen or twenty, and then on horseback, and armed with muskets, horse-pistols, pocket-pistols, swords, dirks, and long knives. Parties have left town armed in this manner, with their faces painted after the fashion of the Indians.—Cor. of N. Y. Jour. of Com.

FROM FRANCE.

The ship Rubicon from Havre, bringing Paris papers to the 14th, received at the Courier office. M. Boissel-Comte is appointed to succeed M. Serre at the U. States, as Minister of France, but will not assume his functions until the friendly relations between the two countries are fully re-established. A Paris paper of the 13th January says, that the public attention on that day was divided between the melancholy details of the late New York and the discussion of the Address to His Majesty, the King of the French, by the Chamber of Deputies. The sad intelligence from this country has cast a general gloom over the English, American, and a portion of the French population. The expression of sympathy which the melancholy catastrophe thus spontaneously called forth, was universal, as the feeling was profound. Subscriptions in aid of the more indigent sufferers were immediately opened, both by French and American gentlemen.

A horrible massacre occurred in Barcelona on the 5th February, long details of which are contained in Galignani's Messenger of the 14th. It appeared that some of the Carlist chiefs had escaped from prison, and at a Court Martial, some of them having been convicted of several acts of atrocity, were so slightly sentenced that the troops attacked the citadel, putting all the prisoners, even the sick to death. The mob almost all belonged to the 12th battalion of the National Guard, which contributed most powerfully to the revolution in August last. The first prisoner who fell under the weapons of these merciless wretches, was Col. O'Donnell, who was captured at Olot. His body was thrown from the rampart to the multitude below, who rushed with howlings of rage and joy upon their bloody prey; and after dragging him through all the streets by a rope attached to his feet, burnt the mutilated remains. At seven o'clock in the evening of the ensuing day, there was a contest before the residence of the Captain General, between the troops and the mob.

On the night of the 6th, the whole of the wine stores of M. Sprenger and M. Motz, on the Facade des Chartons, at Bordeaux, were consumed by fire, together with near 300 pipes of the finest wines. Loss estimated at 700,000 francs.

What a glorious time is the freedom of the press in this country! The Grand Jury of Onondaga county, N. Y. have refused to find a bill of indictment against the Vandal, Ostragoths and Visigoths, who forcibly entered the office of the Utica Standard and Democrat, and threw the types to the street at the time of the anti-slavery riot last fall. So much for so much. The thing should form a part of another era—Reformer.

In New York on Thursday night, a female and her infant of two months old, the wife and child of the mate of a vessel at sea, were turned out of doors for nonpayment of a debt of \$18. She had been left by her husband, with an order on the consignees for half his wages, viz. \$14 a month, which order had been accepted, and with which she had been enabled to support herself and child, until attacked with sickness, when she incurred the debt of \$19, for which she was ejected as she said by the humane landlord, from his house, on the eve of a cold winter's night. Yesterday morning she came to the Police office with her infant, and stated her situation to Justice Bloodgood, who immediately presented her with a check on the Mechanics' Bank for \$20, to pay the debt due to her landlord, and despatched Mr. Gilbert Hoyt with her to the landlord, to have her immediately reinstated in her former lodgings, in which he entirely succeeded.

THE WEATHER. Among the numerous complaints which have lately saluted our ears, we have heard no lamentation that we have not had snow enough, sleighing enough, ice enough, or winter enough. The middle of our streets are literally piled with snow. Yesterday was the eighth day it has snowed since the commencement of the present month, and the 23d since November 23d. During the present month, thus far, the mercury has been four times below zero, viz. the 2d, 3d, 5th and 6th. We have had several other severely cold days, with the mercury varying from five to fifteen above zero. The week now drawing to a close, has been cold and very uncomfortable. The mercury yesterday morning before sunrise was only nine above zero. It has been a very extraordinary winter, and, we believe, there are very few in our city of brotherly love, but would be heartily glad of the opportunity of bidding the cold, and all his suit of snow, hail, ice, sleet, &c. a hearty farewell, until next Christmas.—U. S. Phil. Gaz.

A MAN BURIED IN THE SNOW. A man named Taylor, a resident of Monroe in this county, was ascending the bank of Deerfield river, a day or two after the recent heavy snow storm, when a drift which he was trying to struggle through, broke away from the bank, took him off his feet, and after carrying him some distance down the declivity, left him fixed, head downwards, with five or six feet of snow above him. He struggled violently to liberate himself, but ineffectually; till his strength failed him, and it seemed to him, by his own subsequent account, as if the bitterness of death was past. It so happened that his sudden disappearance was noticed by some persons who were on a hill at a quarter of a mile's distance—help was procured, and after a long and fatiguing search, he was finally dug out, two hours from the time when this wintry tomb closed over him, and in a state of suspended consciousness from which he recovered slowly and with great difficulty.—Greenfield Mercury.

We have been favored, says the National Gazette, with the following extract from a letter dated Natchez, Jan. 11, 1836, received this morning by a gentleman of our city:

'I have just stopped this to say that Natchez under the hill was burned up last night except about twelve houses. Six or eight attempts have been made to fire the town on the hill, no doubt by the gamblers and abolitionists. (?) We keep a good look out. We wait for no law if it is placed on any one. Shoot or hang is the word. The inhabitants are very much excited. An attempt has been made upon our cotton yard, in which we have 150,000 dollars worth of cotton, but shipping it as fast as possible.'

Suicide by Laudium. On Tuesday morning, a gentleman border at the Hanover Hotel, hearing groans in a chamber contiguous to his own, occupied by Mrs. Eliza Reed, a lady who arrived from New York last Saturday, and took lodgings at the Hotel, called a maid servant, who discovered on going into the chamber, Mrs. Reed dead in her bed and an empty four ounce phial on the table, labelled laudanum. We understand that the deceased was a very handsome woman, about forty-five years old, and separated from her husband. She has several children, and about two years since a daughter destroyed herself in the same manner as the mother. She has relatives residing in the city, and it is thought some property. There was nothing in her conduct whilst at the hotel which attracted any special notice, or was thought strange or improper.—Transcript.

Accounts from St. John's (N. F.) to the 18th December, represent the Small Pox as raging there to a frightful extent. Upwards of 2000 cases had occurred, and 500 individuals had been swept away by it to the tomb.—Transcript.

SAD ACCIDENT. Yesterday afternoon about two o'clock, the snow fell from the roof of house No. 17 Sullivan-street, (the upper part of which was occupied as a school) burying beneath it two of the scholars who were in the yard, one of whom was killed instantly. The other escaped with one leg broken and otherwise injured, but is expected to recover. The name of the one killed was Guderli; the other, Elder.—N. Y. Jour. of Com.

NOTICE.

An adjourned meeting of the BOSTON YOUNG MEN'S ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will be held at the Hall, No. 46, Washington-street, on THURSDAY EVENING next, at 7 o'clock, for the discussion of the following question:—Is a man justified in coming into the nominal relation of master to his slaves, when in fact he considers and treats them as free-men? The public generally are invited to

LITERARY.

(From the New-York Evangelist.)

LINES

Written upon reading the account of the departure of
Mr. George Thompson, for England.
 And hast thou left our land, devoted one,
 Herald of freedom, and her darling son?
 Dost thou round the globe, which bears thee home,
 Dash the mountain-wave and billowy foam?
 As swiftly on she speeds the ocean's o'er,
 To Albion's sea-girt isle, and distant shore,
 Where thou with men of kindred mind hast plead
 For those who 'neath oppression toiled and bled,
 Till far and wide as Britain's wide domain,
 Where'er a slave had breathed or clanked a chain,
 The sound was heard—it thundered o'er the sea—
 FREEDOM TO SLAVES!—they heard it, and were free.

The work was done—borne on the western gale
 From free Columbia came the Negro's wail
 Imploring aid, in entered in thine ear,
 And started from thine eye the pitying tear;
 Borne on the wings of love to all mankind,
 With Howard's spirit, Wilberforce's mind,
 Thou cross'd the Atlantic, and we heard thy voice
 Whisper in Africa's ear the word—'Rejoice,'
 Pleading for million's manacled and dumb,
 Like one whose heart with sympathy was wrung,
 Till pity's generous flame, in every breast,
 Glowed and expanded for the poor oppressed.

Oh as we've listened to thy words of power,
 We've seen oppression's minions quail and cower;
 And he—who sought from revelation's page
 To justify oppression's lawless rage,
 To find a warrant there for wrong and crime,
 Abhorred to the golden rule divine—
 Felt in his cheeks the rising blush of shame,
 As freedom's sacred cause and holy name
 Thou didst defend, and with tremendous sway
 Sweep all their refugees of lies away.

Thou hadst thy foes, and jealous Envy's eye
 Saw in thee worth she dare not with thee vie;
 While some despised thee, men of little worth,
 Because another nation gave thee birth,
 And published to the world thine only aim
 Was that of bloodshed and dishonor's reign.
 We name not all, and yet we name the last,
 Foul slander sought thy spotless fame to blast:
 We pass it by, for slavery's deeds of night
 Shun the keen gaze of scrutiny and light;
 'Twas born in darkness, and is based upon
 Falsehood, deceit, and robbery, and wrong.

But thou hast left us—yet 'twas not in vain,
 That thou for us didst cross the billowy main:
 Thy works have followed in thy path—they tell
 What thou hast done for those thou lov'st so well.
 Columbia is enslaved—HER CHILDREN SOLD
 And battered like the brutes for paltry gold;
 Thy spirit like a spreading flame hath spread,
 And converts thronging in thy footsteps tread:
 And still it spreads—our country yet shall feel
 The force of moral power her wounds can heal;
 And when the trump of freedom shall proclaim
 Deliverance to the captive from his chain,
 And all her sons in bondage shall go free
 And worship at the shrine of Liberty,
 She'll not forget thy name, but thankful raise
 With Africa's sons a tribute to thy praise.
 Till then, like those who miss thy presence here,
 Thy burning eloquence, and soul sincere,
 We bid thee now, as those who loved thee well,
 With grateful hearts, the parting word—FAREWELL!
 Pawtucket, Mass. Dec. 1853. J. W.—

(From the Vermont Telegraph.)

A DIALOGUE.

Bible.—Dare not invade thy neighbor's right.
 Always his welfare keep in sight:
 Thus saith the God above,
 You're kindred all, born of one blood;
 Be kind to all—to all do good;
 Thy God—thy neighbor love.

Conscience.—'Tis wrong to take what is not mine,
 In slavish chains my race confine,
 Because they are not white.
 The black man's home is dear to him;
 'Tis wrong to tear him from his kin;
 'Tis wrong—it can't be right.

Slave-Stealer.—Though I Jehovah shall displease,
 I'll rob and steal where'er I please,
 I'll 'twice increase my wealth.
 I will not bend the broken sigh;
 My heart I'll close to mercy's cry,
 Destroying peace and health.

Bible.—Love to thy neighbor works no ill;
 Its fruits are kindness and good will;
 It prompts to charity;
 Relieves the needy in distress,
 Visits and soothes the fatherless,
 A friend to liberty.

Conscience.—'Tis right to do my neighbor good;
 'Tis wrong to deal in human blood;
 Humanity says 'Aye.'
 'Tis wrong to buy poor Africa's slaves,
 For you encourage robbers, knaves—
 Avarice, alone, says 'Nay.'

Slave-Buyer.—Away with duty—'tis but trash;
 For all my slaves I pay the cash;
 No one can this forbid.
 If I do not this slave secure,
 My neighbor will, this I am sure—
 Therefore, I'll make a bid.

Bible.—O, man! be kind—to others do
 As you'd have others do to you;
 This God requires of thee.
 Break Slavery's yokes, where'er they're found—
 Knock off the chains which they're bound—
 Let all the oppress'd go free.

Conscience.—These cursed fetters are too strong:
 These galling chains, they're worn too long:
 Now speak them liberty.
 'Tis wrong to task and lash the slave;
 O, save him further anguish, save—
 Just say the words, 'you're free!'

Slave-Holder.—No—All of Africa's race deserve
 The white man constantly to serve;
 For God has marked them plain.
 They're such a black and ignorant race,
 To use them ill is no disgrace:
 I'll not regard their pain.

C. B. H.

MARRIAGE HYMN.

BY MRS. L. H. SIGOURNEY.
 Not for the summer's hour alone,
 When skies resplendent shine,
 And youth and pleasures fill the throne,
 Our hearts and hands we join;
 But for those stern and wintry days
 Of sorrow, pain and fear,
 When heaven's wise discipline doth make
 Our earthly journey dear.
 Not for this span of life alone,
 Which like a blast doth fly,
 And as the transient flower of grass
 Just blossoms, droop and die;
 But for a being without end,
 This vow of love we take.
 Grant us, O God, one home at last,
 For our Redeemer's sake.

ABOLITION DEBATE IN CONGRESS.

SENATE, Friday, Feb. 12.

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.

The memorial from the Society of Friends in Lancaster Co., Pennsylvania, praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, was taken up.

The question pending thereon—being, first, a motion submitted by Mr. Calhoun, 'shall the petition be received?'

Second.—A motion by Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Moore referred to the proceedings taken by the fanatics, and argued against the propriety of receiving any more petitions on this subject. It was not right that Congress should hold out any encouragement to them. Refusal to receive such petitions was not an infringement on the right of petition, inasmuch as the parties were praying for the redress of grievances, which did not affect themselves. Much excitement was naturally produced by them throughout the south, so much so, that the several legislatures of the southern states, and among them his own State, (Alabama) were passing resolutions, calling on the other States to give them their aid in putting down those whose measures were so obnoxious to them. The time was approaching when instead of non-committalism, the south would expect that every man would toe the mark on this question, and nothing less than a declaration, that Congress had no power to legislate on the subject, would be satisfactory to the south; in the mean time he would oppose the reception of all petitions.

Mr. King of Georgia, said that he differed with his Southern friends as to the course they were pursuing, he felt it necessary to explain the views which actuated him in voting against the motion made by the Senator from South Carolina. There was no difference of opinion between them on the general question of abolition; all they differed in was, as to the best mode of putting down the pernicious disturbers of the public peace. It is a subject of regret to him, that the motion 'not to receive' had been made: because a discussion on the subject had been created, and an excitement got up, which was impolitic and prejudicial to the interests of the South, and because this made it necessary for Congress to act on the question, when it should rather have been left alone. If petitions were rejected, the consequence would be, that they would be increased, and in fact, instead of the issue being, whether or not the right of the slaveholding States were guaranteed by the Constitution, a new issue would be created between the North and the South, as to the right of petition. This would further increase a discussion which could only be serviceable to the prospects of A. Tappan and his fraternity. They could not, he thought, if in the pay of the Nassau street Directory, adopt a course more effectual, or play a better game in the furtherance of their designs. He held, that the right of petition was too secure to be trifled with. There was no force in the objection as to the language of a petition. They were sent there to do the business of their constituents, and who, if they thought their interests were not attended to, or that they, the Senate, were a parcel of scoundrels, they had the right to tell them so by their petitions, and Congress was bound to receive them, whatever disposition they might subsequently take with them. They sent them here to do their business, he repeated, and certainly not to establish courts of dignity for the purpose of scrutinizing the language in petitions. He contended that the right of Congress extended over the district as much as that of the several state legislatures over the States; but that right, he could not admit, was to violate the rights of property. Being unwilling to give the abolitionists such an undue advantage as a change in the issue on this subject would give them, he could not vote for the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. Calhoun declined following the Senator from Georgia in reply to his remarks. He heard them with sentiments of the deepest grief and mortification, not that they would ultimately be of a pernicious effect, but that on this subject at least, when union was strength, he desired to see the whole south act as one man. Throughout the whole debate he had studiously avoided making any personal imputations. The language of the Senator from Georgia, struck him as being peculiarly harsh. He understood the Senator to say that those who advocated rejection, did so as a mere pretext for agitation.

Mr. King disclaimed this. Mr. Calhoun continued. The Senator said, that acting as those did who wished to reject these petitions, they were playing the part of 'agitators.' He had from the commencement acted solely on the defensive. The petitions that were presented represented the constituents of the Hon. Senator, as well as those of all the rest of the south as man-stealers, pirates, &c. and asked Congress to do that which it had no power to do. Was he in such a case to keep silent? He had not sought to introduce the subject, but had merely done that which every Senator had a right to do upon the presentation of any petition—to demand the preliminary question, and yet, for this he was to be accused of being an agitator.—But, who, he inquired, really is the agitator: is it the man who opposes the reception of such petitions or him, who encouraged them? The answer, he feared not to leave to the decision of their common constituency—to the south. Notwithstanding this denunciation of the cry that there was an interference with the right of petition, he would demand the preliminary question on every one that should be presented. He would ask the Senator from Georgia, would he receive a petition couched in insulting language, praying for abolition in his own State?

Mr. King replied in the affirmative. Mr. Calhoun then would only say that the Senator's mind was differently constituted from his own, for, rather than consent to receive such a petition reflecting on his State (S. C.) he would cheerfully lay his head on the block; he believed this was the most dangerous question ever agitated since the formation of the Government, and that the only mode they should adopt, was to meet it with stern and inflexible opposition. He would turn the tables, and designate all those as agitators, who should be willing that such petitions should be received; for the moment they were received, from thence, the right of Congress to grant abolition, would be recognised.

Mr. Hill contended that too much importance was given to the acts of the fanatics, and he denied that public opinion in the north was at all in favor of abolition; he considered that the subject was got up for party objects, and such were the motives which had influenced the press. He instanced the *Telegraph*, as having done more mischief to the slaveholding states on this question, than all the pamphlets, prints, &c. circulated by the Abolition Society. That paper for the last five years has been endeavoring to create a northern and southern party,—to destroy the Union. It was in this spirit, the excitement about the Tariff had been created, and which engendered the nullification schemes—and consequent disgrace upon South Carolina.

Mr. Calhoun rose to order. Was such language to be used to a sovereign State?

The Vice President. (Mr. Hubbard, pro tem.) said he understood the language was applied to the course taken by a newspaper.

Mr. Calhoun: I am satisfied Mr. President, I am only happy to say that the language comes from a quarter, that it is not disgraceful to the State it should come from.

Mr. Hill said he appreciated, as they deserved the remarks of the Senator, and he proceeded to read extracts from newspapers—to show by accounts therein, of sundry public meetings in New Hampshire, that public opinion was against the Abolitionists.

After some explanatory remarks from Mr. Leigh and Mr. King.

Mr. Calhoun rose and said, that although he was sure the Senator from New Hampshire, from his standing in that body, could not expect that he would notice any thing that had fallen from him, as no Senator who had any respect for himself could notice one, who was so constantly attributing to others unworthy personal motives. Yet as statements had been made, that public opinion in favor of abolition was extinct in New Hampshire, he would simply refer to a newspaper published in that State—the *Herald of Freedom*—which went to dates and papers, and stated that whole townships were in their favor, and which contained language grossly calumniating the South.

[The newspaper was read by the Secretary to the Senate, and contained a review of the speeches of Mr. Hill and Mr. Pierce, in the House of Representatives, and contradicted their former statements.]

Mr. Hill insisted on the accuracy of his statement; he did not believe there was one in five hundred in New Hampshire in favor of abolition; and this fact should not be kept back for party objects from the South. He would admit, that there was such a paper as the *Herald* published in this State, but it was of foreign origin, and supported by foreign funds, and which did not receive any countenance or enjoy any circulation there. Adverting to what had been said by the Senator from South Carolina, as to himself personally, he would simply state he knew nothing of the standing which one Senator had there more than another—all were equal—he was sent there by the votes of his constituents, his rights were as good as his—and however he may express contempt and disgust for him, there, it could not be greater than the disgust and contempt which he felt for that Senator every where.

The debate was further continued by Mr. Benton, Mr. Buchanan, and Mr. Calhoun, and the subject was finally postponed until Monday next, to which day, on motion of Mr. Buchanan, the Senate stands adjourned.

SENATE, Monday, Feb. 15.

The subject of the memorial of the Society of Friends in Philadelphia, praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, was taken up, and

Mr. Tallmadge made some remarks in favor of the sacredness of the right of petition, and the duty of Congress to guard it inviolably. He consequently opposed the motion of Mr. Calhoun not to receive the petition, and denied that there were any abolitionists in the North, except those fanatics who have rendered themselves so notorious by their conduct.

Mr. Swift made a few observations, in which he maintained that in the State of Vermont, there was a large and respectable class of individuals, deeply impressed with the conviction that Congress had the right to interfere with slavery in the District of Columbia, and to act upon that subject to a certain extent.

Mr. Niles then apologized for reading a speech which he had prepared, and continued reading until the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. Pierce, of N. H. asked the consent of the House to make some explanations in reply to a statement recently read in the Senate of the U. S. by an honorable member of that body, impugning his character and veracity. The Senator had made all the apology that was necessary, so far as the Senator and himself were concerned. Objections being made, Mr. Pierce moved the suspension of the rules, for the purpose indicated.

The motion was agreed to, and Mr. P. proceeded to comment on an article in an abolition paper, printed at Concord, N. H. denying the statement of Mr. P. concerning the number of abolitionists in New Hampshire, and remarking that 'figures do not lie, though some of the representatives of the people do.'

[This paragraph was read in the Senate, on Friday, by Mr. Calhoun, as a proof that Mr. Hill's assertion, that abolition in New Hampshire was extinct, was not true.]

Mr. P. sent the article to the Clerk, to be read, and then went into a number of statements and arguments in support of his assertion, that 'not one in five hundred' of his constituents countenanced the doctrines of the Abolitionists.

Mr. P. adverted, also, to a report, which he understood had been circulated, that while he made the above assertion, he had abolition petitions which he refused to present, and that petitions from five thousand persons in New Hampshire had been forwarded to different members for presentation. He said he had received no petitions, and he called upon his colleagues and others to state whether any had been received by them.

Mr. Borden of Massachusetts replied, that he had received one which had been presented. (Another was produced, which had been sent to Mr. Burns of New Hampshire.)

Mr. Pierce read the names of the signers to the latter petition to show that they were all females. He stated that he was informed that most of them were children at school, and that some canting, hypocritical preacher had been around to the schools to get these signatures. In his own statements, he had intended to refer to the opinions and course, not of women and children, but of the yeomanry of New Hampshire,—of the legal voters in the state. Mr. P. said he had expected, by his course on this subject, to draw upon himself the denunciations of the abolitionists, but he had no reason to suppose that southern gentleman would aid in giving publicity and credit to an article which was equally unjust to himself and to his constituents. The senator who had brought the paragraph to the notice of the senate had disclaimed any design to attack him personally, but, in rushing at his object, he had swept him along. He concluded by reiterating the declaration which he had formerly made, that the people of the White Hills were united in supporting the just rights of the south on this question. Whether there was a conjunction between the two parties in this Union to shake it to its centre or not, he had, he said, the happiness to believe that there was patriotism enough in the people, both of the south and the north, to put down all their efforts, and to transmit to posterity an unbroken Union.

Mr. Pickens explained that the senator from S. C. had read the article as presumptive evidence in reply to the statements of another senator and not with a view to impugn the veracity of the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. Hammond wished to put a question to the gentleman, in which he was concerned personally.

Did the gentleman intend to charge any party with which he (Mr. H.) was connected, with an intention to destroy the Union.

Mr. Pierce.—I did not intend to make and did not make any such charge.

Mr. Hammond.—I am perfectly well satisfied. This being petition day, the Chair proceeded to call the States, in their order, for the presentation of petitions. Massachusetts being called,

Mr. Briggs presented a petition for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and moved that it be referred, without reading, to the Select Committee on that subject.

Mr. Wise objected to the reception of the petition, and asked whether it was the understanding of the Chair, when the resolution of the gentleman from South Carolina was adopted, that, under that resolution, all petitions on the abolition subject, past, present, and to come, were to be referred to the Select Committee; whether, in fine, a petition not in possession of the House, could be referred.

The Chair was of the opinion that only the petitions, the contents of which were known to the House at the time of the adoption of the resolution, were referred, and that the gentleman had a right to object to the reception of the petition.

Mr. Wise asked whether he would be in order to discuss the question of reception.

The Chair replied that it would be in order. Mr. W. proceeded vehemently to protest against the course taken by the gentleman from S. C. (Mr. Pinckney), and declared that the Abolition question had not been settled by his resolution. The gentleman, he said, ought to be 'spurned and hissed as a deserter from the principles of the South.'

The Chair interposed with warmth and advised the gentleman to take his seat. The gentleman said he could not proceed but by a vote of the House.

Then followed a long and confused debate on the order of proceeding.

The words were written down by the Clerk, and read by the Chair, as follows: The gentleman from Va. says he 'spurns and hisses at the gentleman from S. C. as a deserter.'

Mr. Wise said the Chair was a bad reporter. The Chair said the words were substantially those spoken by the gentleman.

Mr. Adams insisted upon the gentleman's affirming or denying the words; it was the right of the gentleman insulted by the words to know whether they were used or not.

Mr. Wise finally admitted the words after adding thereto, 'from the principles of the South on the slavery question.'

Mr. Wise was permitted to explain, and he remarked that he meant no personal attack on the gentleman from S. C. He applied his remarks to the resolution of the gentleman, and to his course, which he had pronounced treasonable to the South. He had not impugned the motives of the gentleman, God only knows what were his motives. If there be a Judas Iscariot amongst us, who had received his thirty pieces of silver, for betraying the South, he did not know it.

Mr. Pinckney rose. This matter, he said, was proceeding a little too far. He had borne the remarks of the gentleman as long as it was possible to bear them. He was proceeding to speak, when

Mr. Wise claimed the floor, which, he said, he had not yielded. He wished it to be understood by the House and by the gentleman himself, that he meant not to attack the motives of the gentleman, nor to insult him personally. He intended his remarks to apply to the course pursued by the gentleman. He meant to characterize an act which committed the south to the tender mercies of the north—an act which would enable the fanatics to raise their banner and shout, *go triumph*, while the south hung her head low, in silent mortification, at the victory achieved over her through the treachery of one of her own sons. Again he would repeat that he intended no personal insult, but against the measures of the gentleman he would protest till the last moment of his existence.

The Chair again attempted to put the question, but was every moment interrupted with disorderly remarks on some points of order.

Mr. Pinckney attempted to speak, but was called to order.

Mr. Pinckney then said, I rise to express the hope that the gentleman from Virginia will be permitted to proceed, and if he has any thing more to say in relation to myself—

The Chair arrested the gentleman's remarks. After more confusion, Mr. Bell called the attention of the House to the point, and moved that the gentleman from Virginia be allowed to proceed.

The question was then taken and determined in the affirmative, yeas 111, nays 92. So

Mr. Wise had permission to proceed. But, before he could get the floor,

Mr. Vinton submitted whether the gentleman had a right to speak on the subject, as it was the object of the resolution lately adopted by the House to arrest the discussion, until the Select Committee should report. All the petitions on the subject of abolition were ordered to be referred to that Committee.

The Chair decided with diffidence, he said, and without an opportunity to consult the authorities, that the Resolution could not apply to the petitions presented subsequently to its adoption.

Mr. Vinton appealed from this decision, and upon the appeal, arose a most earnest discussion, which continued till five o'clock, when, without taking the question,

The House adjourned.

[From a Thanksgiving Sermon, entitled 'Our Liberties in Danger,' preached in Windham, N. H., by Rev. Calvin Cutler.]

THE MONSTER SLAVERY.

Another evil which endangers our liberties, is the existence of Slavery, by which one sixth of the nation are treated as nonentities—denied the privilege of reading the Bible—men turned into brutes—human souls made chattels, to be bought and sold, and used for the gratification of irresponsible masters; who, contrary to our Bill of Rights and the first principles of our free government, have seized and bound their fellow men in cruel bondage. Well was it said by Mr. Jefferson, that God has no attribute by which he can take sides with such oppression. The spirit of the Lord is in this system of wrong and outrage upon inalienable rights, and therefore it cannot stand any longer than God, to show his wrath and make his power known, endures with such long suffering this flagrant usurpation of his prerogative. When our fathers of New England gave their sanction to a recognition of slavery in the union of the States, they seem to have been left of God as was Israel in Canaan, when the Gideonites came to them with mouldy loaves and clouted shoes, under the pretence of a long journey. It was then, however, a day of comparative ignorance in respect to the enormity of this evil. But Slavery is a monster which has grown up with the nation, to feed like the vulture on the vitals of our free institutions. It is a monster so selfish and infernal, and has become so gigantic in stature, that it will not bear to be examined, nor suffer its features to be exposed, without gnashing its teeth, and scattering scintillations of wrath from its eye-balls. But here it is in the nation, with all its deformity—a standing memorial of our shame and hypocrisy, and giving the lie to our Bill of Rights in the face of all the nations of the earth. When the nation hold as self-evident truths, 'that all men are created equal, endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,' one sixth of this very nation have these inalienable rights wrested from them by violence; they are deprived of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and subjected to the condition of the brute creation. And what is most appalling, the great majority love to have it so. Yes, the great majority even of the free States, say, by their conduct, to the slave-masters 'hold on to your victims of cruelty for the present,—we will stand by you and defend you, and keep off the fanatics, who are so

visionary and insane as to call slavery a sin, and use arguments to persuade you to let go your deadly grasp upon the poor innocents.' Is there no danger that our liberties will be infringed and destroyed, when the nation by their practice give the lie to their profession; when they deal in oppression and uphold the oppressor? Is there no reason for alarm, lest He who hears the cry of the poor, and pleads the cause of the oppressed, give the nation up to a reprobate mind to work out their own destruction?

MOB LAW.

The most fearful indication of the speedy downfall of our free institutions, is the recent adoption of mob-law to prevent the freedom of speech respecting slavery. In this the troubled elements of infidelity, licentiousness and oppression, are shaken together, and like the burning lava of the volcano, seems ready to bury our liberties beneath their own ruins. But why is this enormity to be so sacredly guarded from all inquiry? Is it past all doubt, that it is right to trample in the dust and traffic in the sinews and souls of two millions and a half of our brethren, in this land of freedom?

We have supposed that liberty of speech and free inquiry was our inheritance as a free people. But now we are imperceptibly forbidden to discuss or expose this system of wickedness. We must be tongue-tied, and not raise a note of remonstrance nor utter a sigh for this abomination, upon penalty of having our dwellings demolished, and our lives exposed to violence.

How is it, brethren—are we freemen ourselves, or are we slaves? Are you ready to become the supple menials of the South, and neither speak nor feel only as slave-masters or their agents, the mob, give you leave? Are you ready—are the freemen of the free States ready, to bow their necks under the yoke of tyranny, and be whipped into mutes?

But it is said that slavery is a political question, and therefore the moralist and the christian have no right to meddle with it. Just as though wrong and outrage and cruelty and blood were all right in politics, and no man has a right to expose any abuse, or lift his voice of remonstrance to any measure, but the unprincipled demagogue and political aspirant. How strange that men of integrity and character can be duped in this manner; and instead of maintaining their rights or pleading the cause of liberty, can turn apologists for a system of oppression and despotism which outrages all the principles of our free government, and condemns the propagation of the doctrine that 'slavery is a sin, and therefore ought to be abandoned.'

LIBERTY OR SLAVERY.

We claim the constitutional right of thinking and discussing and writing, on this subject as well as any other;—and we shall never relinquish this right so long as we are freemen in a free country. The great contest between liberty and despotism in this country has fallen upon the Abolition Question. On this altar our liberties seem about to be immolated. And now it is at every man's option whether to cast his influence into the scale of liberty or of lawless oppression. If you put down freedom of speech and of the press on this subject, then you put it down on every other. Every man, either in a high station or low, in the ranks of political demagogues or in the church of God, who frowns upon liberty of speech and would muzzle the press, is tying his own tongue, and preparing fetters for his own feet. Every citizen is called to choose between the evils of resisting the exorbitant demands of slaveholders on the one hand, and bowing his neck to the iron yoke of despotism on the other. There is no constitutional law to prevent any man from talking, writing, and publishing, on this or any other subject. On this point the exasperated southerners and their apologists are lame. What then can be done to take away liberty of speech from abolitionists? Can they be put to silence by argument? Why is not this expedient tried? Evidently for the reason, that the oppressor and his advocate know that discussion will tend to the downfall of slavery. It cannot survive free discussion, and therefore we must be gagged. The most summary way of doing this has been supposed to be to create a general sentiment against all discussion, by public meetings and condemnatory resolutions. These give countenance to mobs, who carry out in practice and character the anti-republican sentiments of the resolutions. If proof of this were needed, I might point you to the Capital of our own State, where inflammatory resolutions were past one night to put down free discussion, followed by a mob the next night for the same object. See also the same course of things in Boston, 'the cradle of liberty,' in Utica, and in many other places. Are our liberties in no danger when resort is had to brute force to deprive citizens of their lawful privileges? when this modern Vandalism is set on foot and countenanced by men of influence and character, and when even good men can apologize for such acts of violence, by laying the blame on those who are the innocent occasion of them? We are opposed to mobs; say some of our sapient editors, 'but then the abolitionists are so imprudent and fanatical, that they provoke the public indignation. If they would keep still they would not be molested.' How magnanimous!—how republican! What greater countenance could the most savage banditti ask of any man than this? Why do not religious editors who take this ground, go back and condemn Paul and Silas for preaching the gospel? The Apostles, and Jesus Christ himself, were so fanatical that they provoked the public indignation, till they were mobbed and persecuted even unto death. If they had only held their peace, and been prudent, in the modern popular sense, they would not have drawn upon themselves the public indignation. Is it therefore wrong, imprudent, to preach the gospel? Is it wrong to preach that 'God hath created of one womb to all nations of men;—that it is a duty to 'undo the heavy burdens, to loose the bands of wickedness, and to let the oppressed go free? Was it imprudent for Luther to expose the corruptions of the Papal Hierarchy? Had many of our religious and political editors lived in the fifth century, with all the progressive light of free principles shed upon the world for three hundred years, they would have condemned Luther as a fanatic, an incendiary, scattering fire-brands, an incendiary, and death; and if he will be so imprudent as to propagate his offensive doctrines, why, he must take the consequences.' This is letting loose the 'dogs of war' upon every man who uses moral means to redress grievances, or reform abuses. To find this lawless, time-serving policy advocated or countenanced in the nineteenth century—in this republican America, by even religious periodicals, shows our liberties to be on the brink of a precipice.

The tyrant reproved by his slave.—A poor West India Negro, employed as a domestic in the house of his master who had purchased him, having bought a trifling article of a negro fellow, who had procured it by clandestine means, was detected with the property about him, and therefore ordered by his master to be severely whipped. After he had received the punishment, he said to the officer who had inflicted it, 'Why you no flog white man?' 'So we do, (answered the officer) when they buy stolen goods, knowing them to be stolen.' 'Then stand my nassu; why you no flog him, as you flog poor me?—he buy me—he knew me stolen.'